

## Song of Deborah as Polemic

### 1. *The Song of Deborah: A Victory Song?*

The Song of Deborah in Judg 5 has often been compared to the Song of Moses in Exod 15. This is partly because both songs have traditionally been considered among the most ancient poems in the Old Testament<sup>(1)</sup>, and partly because both share certain similarities in context and subject matter.

Regarding the similarities they share, it has been pointed out, for example, that both songs are narrative poems that appear immediately after a parallel prose account of the same events. Also, in the respective introductory sections, not only are the respective singers identified, the line “I will sing to YHWH” also appears early in both songs (Exod 15,1; Judg 5,3). Moreover, it has also been noted that water imagery is used in the description of both victories. In connection with this, Hauser further argues that this presence of water imagery is not merely due to the fact that water happened to play a significant role in both victories, but in both cases, the motif was similarly used to emphasise the power of YHWH over the enemy<sup>(2)</sup>. Finally, both songs also seem to contain scenes in which the enemy’s self-confidence is mocked. In Exod 15,9, the boasting of the enemy is reported even as their destruction is being recounted, while in Judg 5,28-30, the imaginary boasts of Sisera’s naïve mother and her ladies are also presented even as Sisera’s violent death is being graphically described. In fact, in both cases, the boasting of the enemy is quoted directly to further heighten the irony.

<sup>(1)</sup> For the antiquity of the Song of Deborah, see, for example, W.F. ALBRIGHT, “The Earliest Forms of Hebrew Verse”, *JPOS* 2 (1922) 69-86; D.A. ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* (Missoula 1972) 31-34, 148-150, 153-155; A. GLOBE, “The Literary Structure and Unity of the Song of Deborah”, *JBL* 93 (1974) 509-512. Alternative dating will be discussed briefly at the end of this article. As for the Song of Moses, although it is also traditionally dated early, as E. ZENGER, “Tradition und Interpretation in Exodus XV 1-21”, *Congress Volume, Vienna, 1980* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (Leiden 1981) 456-458, points out, scholarly opinion ranges from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the 5<sup>th</sup> Century BCE.

<sup>(2)</sup> A.J. HAUSER, “Two Songs of Victory: A Comparison of Exodus 15 and Judges 5”, *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (ed. E.R. FOLLIS) (JSOTSS 40; Sheffield 1987) 270-273.

Because of such similarities, many scholars have come to see both songs as belonging to the same genre known as “victory song”<sup>(3)</sup>. However, Hauser concedes that as a genre, “victory song” is a classification based more on content than form, as “there is not enough patterned regularity held in common by Exod 15 and Judg 5 to make it reasonable to propose something so set as a victory song form lying behind these poems”<sup>(4)</sup>. Thus, although both songs employ several common themes, “this commonality does not derive from a concerted effort by each poet to imitate a well-know formal structure for victory songs, but rather from the writer’s basic instinct regarding what was necessary and important in a song praising Israel’s God for the victory”<sup>(5)</sup>.

But despite the similarities outlined above, there are also significant differences between the two songs. First, in contrast to the Song of Moses, where the actual destruction of the Egyptians is described in great detail (Exod 15,3-10), in the Song of Deborah, the actual battle scene depicting the destruction of the enemy is extremely brief, occupying only about four short verses in Judg 5,19-22. Second, while YHWH is depicted as directly involved in bringing about the destruction of the Egyptians in Exod 15,3-10, in the Song of Deborah, victory over the enemy is not directly attributed to YHWH. In fact, YHWH is not even mentioned in the battle scene in vv. 19-22. Third, while the bulk of the Song of Moses is addressed directly to YHWH, with YHWH being consistently referred to in the second person (Exod 15,6-18), in the Song of Deborah, YHWH is so addressed only in Judg 5,4.31. Fourth, while Israel as a nation is not mentioned in the Song of Moses until Exod 15,13-18 after the Egyptians have been completely destroyed, the actions of Israelite tribes and warriors seem to constitute a central focus throughout the Song of Deborah.

<sup>(3)</sup> See, for example, G.F. MOORE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (ICC; New York 1895) 127; J. GRAY, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth* (The Century Bible; London 1967) 221; GLOBE, “Literary Structure”, 495-499; HAUSER, “Two Songs”, 265, 279-280. In this regard, although C. LEVIN “Das Alter des Deboralieds”, *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (BZAW 316; Berlin 2003) 132, 135, characterises the song as a “Thanksgiving Song (Danklied)” on the basis of his analysis of its psalmic elements, the fact that the main cause of thanks is thought to be deliverance in the battle at Tabor puts it also in a category not significantly different from that of a “victory song”.

<sup>(4)</sup> HAUSER, “Two Songs”, 279.

<sup>(5)</sup> HAUSER, “Two Songs”, 281.

What these differences seem to indicate is that, even if one readily accepts the classification of both as a victory song, the Song of Moses and the Song of Deborah appear to be two very different kinds of victory song. And while the Song of Moses seems to conform by and large to what one would typically expect of a hymn praising YHWH for a spectacular victory against an enemy, the same cannot be said of the Song of Deborah. For there, not only does the otherwise spectacular but only briefly-described military victory seem not to be a central focus of the song, the involvement of YHWH in that victory is also alluded to in only two (Judg 5,4-5) out of thirty verses that make up the song. Instead, a significant portion of the song seems to concern the action or inaction of different individuals and groups on the Israelite side, and some of those singled out for attention did not even contribute to the victory supposedly being celebrated.

This therefore raises the possibility that the Song of Deborah may not first and foremost have been intended purely to be a song celebrating a military victory, but that its author may have taken advantage of the occasion to craft a song that appears to be celebratory but that in reality is intended for a very different purpose. As shall be argued in the remainder of this article, it is my contention that the Song of Deborah may in fact be a piece of political polemic dressed up as a victory song, the ultimate goal of which is to discourage non-participation in a war for YHWH's cause by praising those who took part and censuring those who did not.

## *2. The Song of Deborah as Polemic: A Structural Argument*

To make a case for such an understanding, I will focus primarily on the rhetorical structure of the Song of Deborah. The underlying assumption is that apart from words, the rhetorical structure of a literary composition — that is, the way various component parts are carefully arranged within that composition — often serves also as a significant conveyor of meaning. For not only does structure facilitate comprehension by clarifying unit boundaries that mark off subsections of a larger literary work, very often within each subsection, the arrangement of material can also help clarify the main focus of that section<sup>(6)</sup>.

(6) For examples of how the analysis of structure can contribute to the task of interpretation, see, for example, R. MEYNET, *Rhetorical Analysis*. An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric (JSOTSS 256; Sheffield 1998) 19-36; G.T.K. WONG, "Is There a Direct Pro-Judah Polemic in Judges?", *SJOT* 19 (2005) 90-98.

But before the structure of the Song of Deborah is examined, two important issues need to be briefly addressed. First, there is the issue of the song's unity. Although some scholars consider portions of the song to be later additions for liturgical and other purposes<sup>(7)</sup> and have thus suggested excising those portions from the song for consideration, Vincent has highlighted the weakness of such an approach by pointing to the lack of unanimity regarding the precise scope of the alleged additions<sup>(8)</sup>. In light of the speculative nature of such allegations of textual insertions, the unity of the song in its current form will be assumed in the following analysis.

Second, there is also the issue concerning the approach to take in structural analysis. Admittedly, different approaches have been taken in the analysis of Judges 5, including some that are fully or partially based on syllable count, colon count, and other measures of meter and line length<sup>(9)</sup>. Again, Vincent has highlighted some of the weaknesses of such metrical approaches, and his insights need not be repeated again<sup>(10)</sup>.

In the main, I find Vincent's approach based on the use of explicit structural markers convincing, as I do his conclusions. Although there are differences between Vincent's analysis and my own, to begin, I will first attempt to make my case for a possible polemical reading of Judges 5 based on Vincent's analysis of the song's structure. After that, modifications to Vincent's analysis will be made to further substantiate my argument for an overall polemical reading of the song.

At the outset, it should be pointed out that in his conclusion, Vincent has already noted that the Song of Deborah appears not merely to be a war/victory ballad or a hymn of praise to God, but also a text that pays tribute to those who did what they should and warns those who did not<sup>(11)</sup>. This prominent and repeated juxtaposition of two opposing sets of actions and responses, subjected respectively to praise and censure within the song, suggests that a significant rhetorical

<sup>(7)</sup> See, for example, J. BLENKINSOPP, "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah: A Discussion", *Bib* 42 (1961) 62-69; J.A. SOGGIN, *Judges* (OTL; Philadelphia 1987) 95-96, B. LINDARS, *Judges 1-5* (Edinburgh 1995) 218; LEVIN, "Das Alter", 126-135.

<sup>(8)</sup> M.A. VINCENT, "The Song of Deborah: A Structural and Literary Consideration", *JSOT* 91 (2000) 63, n. 9.

<sup>(9)</sup> See, for example, M.D. COOGAN, "A Structural and Literary Analysis of the Song of Deborah", *CBQ* 40 (1978) 143-166.

<sup>(10)</sup> VINCENT, "Song", 66-68.

<sup>(11)</sup> VINCENT, "Song", 81.

purpose of the song may in fact be polemical. But how is this polemical purpose reflected through the structure and content of the song?

The first hint that supports an interpretation of the song as a polemic against non-participation is found in what seems to be a refrain that occurs in Judg 5,2 and 5,9. For as have been frequently pointed out, not only are these two verses both marked by the same occurrence of בִּרְכוּ יְהוָה, this call to bless YHWH is also immediately preceded in each case by a phrase that contains a Hithpael of נָדַב and the noun עָם. Furthermore, although the initial colon of v. 2 and v. 9 do not resemble each other, the name יִשְׂרָאֵל is nonetheless found in both, as each seems to make reference to those in leadership position within Israel<sup>(12)</sup>. In addition, both these calls to bless YHWH are also immediately followed by respective commands to listen and ponder as praises to YHWH (v. 3) and songs about YHWH and His people (vv. 10-11c) are sung<sup>(13)</sup>. Such linguistic and contextual similarities thus led Vincent to conclude that v. 2 and v. 9 are likely a refrain that marks the beginning of two major sections within the song<sup>(14)</sup>.

But if v. 2 and v. 9 indeed function as a refrain that introduces two major sections, then it is noteworthy that in this refrain, the explicit call to bless YHWH is linked not so much to the victory itself, but to the demonstration of leadership and the voluntary participation of the people in battle<sup>(15)</sup>. Since this focus on participation seems to be an

(12) While חֹזְקֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in v. 9a clearly refers to Israel's rulers or commanders, LINDARS, *Judges*, 225-227, and others have argued that פְּרִעוֹת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל in v. 2a also most likely refers to those who led in Israel.

(13) Admittedly, the exact meaning of פָּרְסוּ in v. 11c is unclear. But if it indeed refers to YHWH's people as LINDARS, *Judges*, 247, and L.E. STAGER, "Archaeology, Ecology, and Social History: Background Themes to the Song of Deborah", *Congress Volume: Jerusalem, 1986* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (Leiden 1988) 224-226, suggest, then the fact that the people are mentioned together with YHWH would add weight to argument that the song of Deborah is not just about celebrating a victory but about the role YHWH's people can and should play in contributing to that victory.

(14) VINCENT, "Song", 69-70. Likewise, LINDARS, *Judges*, 224-225, also considers both verses headings to their respective sections, although he also understands them chiastically as inclusios to an introductory sequence.

(15) It is generally accepted that the similarly phrased second colon in both v. 2 and v. 9 refers to the people's willingness to offer themselves to participate in battle. In fact, G. GERLEMAN, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Stylistics", VT 1 (1951) 176, n. 2, and P.C. CRAIGIE, "A Note on Judges V 2", VT 18 (1968) 399, both argue for a specific interpretation of the initial colon of v. 2 on the basis of parallelism with the second colon, which is understood by both as referring to the people's willingness to offer themselves.

ongoing theme in the rest of the song as those who took part in battle are praised while those who refused to are censured, one can argue that this introductory refrain in fact serves as a preview of a basic concern of the whole song, a concern that has more to do with the people's willingness to participate during a time of national crisis rather than the simple celebration of victory itself.

The second indication that a significant concern of the song has to do with the issue of participation (or lack thereof) is found in the structural bracketing of vv. 11d-13. In his analysis, Vincent argues that after the second refrain in v. 9 and the accompanying command to ponder in vv. 10-11c, the rest of the section is roughly divided into three subsections: vv. 11d-13, vv. 14-18 and vv. 19-22. He argues that the fourfold repetition of  $\aleph$  in vv. 11d.13.19.22 actually functions as a structural marker that gives rise to two sets of inclusios, bracketing vv. 11d-13 as one stanza and vv. 19-22 as another, leaving the remaining unmarked material in between as a third stanza<sup>(16)</sup>. But what is of interest here is that in the first stanza comprising vv. 11d-13, the inclusio is marked not only by  $\aleph$ , but perhaps more significantly, also by the mention of "the people of YHWH (עַם־יְהוָה)" and the description of them "going down (יָרַד)", presumably to participate in battle against the enemy<sup>(17)</sup>. This use of the participation of YHWH's people as a structural marker even for a relatively short stanza thus again highlights this theme of participation as a key focus within the song.

Third, in the stanza comprising vv. 14-18, where the tribes that participated are listed along with those that did not, it is worth noting that structurally, the implied rebukes against the non-participating tribes are sandwiched between implied praises for the tribes that did participate:

<sup>(16)</sup> VINCENT, "Song", 74-75.

<sup>(17)</sup> It is admittedly unclear where the strophe break is and whether v. 11d should be read with what immediately precedes in v. 11a-c, thus referring to participation in victory celebration, or with what immediately follows, thus referring to an earlier gathering to participate in battle. SOGGIN, *Judges*, 87-88, seems to take the former view, but D.I. BLOCK, *Judges, Ruth* (The New American Commentary; Nashville, 1999) 230, arguing that the mention of "gates (שַׁעֲרִים)" in v. 11d is an echo of v. 8 where the same word is mentioned in the context of war, sees v. 11d as a thesis statement to vv. 12-18. If v. 11d is indeed crafted to function as part of an inclusio together with v. 13, then BLOCK's view seems more likely since the reference to the people going down with the mighty ones in v. 13 seems to introduce what follows in vv. 14-18. Such a reading would then understand v. 11d as the beginning of the actual recounting referred to in v. 11b-c.

A. Roll Call of tribes that participated in the campaign (vv. 14-15a).

B. Roll Call of tribes that did not participate (vv. 15b-17).

A'. Praise for tribes that have shown special valour in their participation (v. 18).

This chiasmic arrangement that places the non-participating tribes at the structural centre of the stanza seems designed to draw attention to the non-participants, thus suggesting again that a significant rhetorical purpose of the song may be to present a polemic against non-participation<sup>(18)</sup>. Otherwise, for a song written primarily to celebrate a victory, one would expect the focus to be only on those who contributed to that victory and not on those who did not.

Fourth, this surprising attention on non-participation continues in v. 23, where the city of Meroz is cursed for its refusal to help in YHWH's cause. Interestingly, this is followed by a pronouncement of blessing on Jael in v. 24. Here, the fact that Meroz is twice cursed (אָרֵר) while Jael is twice referred to as blessed (בָּרַךְ) seems to suggest that the two are intentionally juxtaposed for contrast<sup>(19)</sup>. Moreover, since the pronouncement of blessing on Jael is immediately followed in vv. 25-27 by an account of how she managed to kill Sisera, while the pronouncement of curses on Meroz is explicitly said to be due to its refusal to help, it is highly likely that the curse and the corresponding blessing are intended to represent respectively the consequence of non-participation and the reward for participation. If so, not only does this continue the theme of participation versus non-participation introduced in vv. 14-18, the very juxtaposition of the curse and blessing also seems designed to further reinforce the polemic already introduced against non-participation.

Finally, even the placement and description of the actual battle in vv. 19-22 seem oriented towards a further development of the theme "participation versus non-participation". For not only is vv. 19-22 sandwiched between two sections (vv. 14-18 and vv. 23-27) that highlight participation versus non-participation, the very structure of

<sup>(18)</sup> A similar point is also made by R.H. O'CONNELL, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (VTS 63; Leiden 1996) 117, who notes that by placing the tribes at the geographic periphery at the structural centre in vv. 15b-17, their absence from the rally is shown to be the focal concern of the strophe, which serves a rhetoric of rebuke.

<sup>(19)</sup> This is especially so in light of the fact that אָרֵר and בָּרַךְ are also used in Gen 12,3; 27,29; Num 22,6.12; 24,9; Jer 20,14; Mal 2,2 as a pair that provides significant binary opposition. In fact, areas in which Israel is said to be blessed (בָּרַךְ) in Deut 28,3-8 if she obeys YHWH are repeated almost exactly in Deut 28,16-19 as the very same areas that will be cursed (אָרֵר) if she disobeys.



vv. 19-22 can also be seen as chiastically arranged to focus on the participation of non-human elements to defeat the enemy:

- A. Kings came for battle but they did not prevail (v. 19).
- B. Forces in the heavenly realm (the stars) participated in battle (v. 20).
- B'. Forces of nature (the Kishon River) also played a role (v. 21).
- A'. The kings (their horses) retreated in chaos (v. 22).

Admittedly, what the stars represent and what role they play here are unclear. While Craigie argues on the basis of Ugaritic parallels that the stars may refer to a heavenly army getting involved in the battle alongside the Israelites<sup>(20)</sup>, Sawyer seems to regard the stars as part of the natural realm as he sees the verse as possibly referring to a solar eclipse that took place in 1131 BCE when Mercury, Venus, Mars, and five other bright stars can be seen over the regions of Megiddo and Taanach<sup>(21)</sup>. But the most widely accepted view is to see the stars as representing the source of rain, as is common in Canaanite mythology<sup>(22)</sup>.

But regardless of how one understands this reference to the stars, it is still possible to argue that even this brief and somewhat cryptic account of the battle and its outcome functions as part of the polemic against non-participation. For if even forces of nature are shown to be participating in battle on YHWH's side to defeat the enemy, then the refusal of any Israelite tribe or city to participate would be seen as all the more reprehensible and without excuse.

From the above five points, it seems clear that not only does the refrain that introduces the two major sections of the song focus on the theme of participation, the content and arrangement of material in the bulk of the song in vv. 11d-24 also reflect a continuing emphasis on participation versus non-participation.

<sup>(20)</sup> P.C. CRAIGIE, "Three Ugaritic Notes on the Song of Deborah", *JSOT* 2 (1977) 33-38. For further discussion of Egyptian, Greek, and Mesopotamian parallels where stars are seen as divine agents taking part in battle, see also M. WEINFELD, "Divine Intervention in War and Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East", *History, Historiography, and Interpretation*. Studies in Biblical Cuneiform Literatures (eds. H. TADMOR – M. WEINFELD) (Jerusalem 1984) 124-131.

<sup>(21)</sup> J.F.A. SAWYER, "'From Heaven Fought the Stars' (Judges V 20)", *VT* 31 (1981) 88.

<sup>(22)</sup> See BLENKINSOPP, "Ballad Style", 73; J. GRAY, "Israel in the Song of Deborah", *Ascribe to the Lord*. Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie (eds. L. ESLINGER – G. TAYLOR) (JSOTSS 67; Sheffield 1988) 425, n. 9; LINDARS, *Judges*, 268.



Thus far, arguments for an understanding of the song as polemic against non-participation have essentially been made on the basis of Vincent's analysis of the song's structure. But as the following discussion will show, a slightly different analysis of the structure of vv. 14-24 is actually possible without this polemical understanding of the song being in any way diminished.

Earlier, it has been noted that vv. 14-18 seems to be arranged chiastically with the focus being placed on the non-participating tribes at the structural centre of this chiasm. But this proposed chiastic arrangement is actually somewhat imbalanced in that A' is actually significantly shorter than either A or B<sup>(23)</sup>. Furthermore, an examination of A and B show a certain parallel in structure that does not characterise A'. For in the two tribal roll calls found in A and B, each contains a designation that, strictly speaking, is non-tribal: Makir in v. 14c and Gilead in v. 17a.

Here, Makir very likely represents the half tribe of Manasseh west of the Jordan<sup>(24)</sup>. After all, according to Gen 50,23 and Num 26,9, Makir was a son of Manasseh, and the clan so named is counted as belonging to the tribe. Although Josh 17,1-6 seems to suggest that all Makirites received land east of the Jordan, Josh 13,31 suggests that only half the sons of Makir actually received land in the east. For the rest of the Makirites, their inheritance probably lay west of the Jordan. Since the mention of Gilead in v. 17a likely includes the Manassites who have settled east of the Jordan, the reference to Makir in v. 14c probably refers to those who have settled in the west. The use of Makir rather than Manasseh here is probably to distinguish the two halves of the tribe who took different stances with regard to participation in the war.

As for Gilead, since the geographic area known as Gilead covering

(23) Admittedly, the idea of "balance" regarding approximate length of material is not generally considered a criterion in identifying structure, especially not in narrative literature. However, given the almost exact correspondences often found in poetic parallelism, perhaps a case can be made that in poetry, chiasm and panelling are sometimes treated as extended applications of poetic parallelism and are thus subjected to more formal constraints. In any case, in the two instances in the following analysis where I bring up the issue of "balance", there is also other evidence to support the analysis, such that "balance" is not the only criterion for making a judgement.

(24) A.E. CUNDALL, "Judges", *Judges & Ruth* (by A.E. CUNDALL – L. MORRIS) (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries; Downers Grove 1968) 98; R.G. BOLING, *Judges*. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary (AB; Garden City 1975) 112.

the mountainous area east of the Jordan was occupied by the tribe of Gad plus the eastern half of the tribe of Manasseh, the reference in v. 17a may very well be a reference to those one and a half tribes<sup>(25)</sup>.

If so, then each of the complementary roll calls in A and B would have equally mentioned exactly four and a half tribes: Ephraim, Benjamin, the western half of Manasseh (Makir), Zebulun, and Issachar in A; Reuben, Gad and the eastern half of Manasseh (Gilead), Dan, and Asher in B.

In fact, a further structural parallel can also be seen in A and B in that the material concerning Issachar, the last tribe mentioned in the roll call of participating tribes, is significantly lengthier than the material concerning any of the other participating tribes. Moreover, within this roll call of participating tribes, Issachar is the only tribe to have been mentioned twice<sup>(26)</sup>. Interestingly, in the following roll call of non-participating tribes, the material concerning Reuben, the first tribe mentioned, is also significantly lengthier than the material concerning any of the other non-participating tribes. And like Issachar, Reuben is also the only tribe among the non-participants to be mentioned twice. In this regard, the two roll calls seem to represent a mirror image of each other in terms of their structural arrangement.

<sup>(25)</sup> C.F. BURNEY, *The Book of Judges* (New York 1970) 142; MOORE, *Judges*, 155; AULD, *Judges*, 159; BLOCK, *Judges*, 233, all see the reference to Gilead as a substitution for Gad since otherwise, Gad would have been the only non-southern tribe not represented in the roll-call in vv. 14-18. This understanding is also supported by readings in the Peshitta and in some LXX manuscripts. But the fact that Gilead is used instead of Gad probably suggests that the designation is meant to include also the half tribe of Manasseh to balance the mention of Makir in v.14c. After all, the grouping of the two together under a shared geographic designation makes sense if both had taken the same stance regarding participation in the war against Sisera.

<sup>(26)</sup> Admittedly, there is some debate as to whether Issachar is indeed mentioned twice within v. 15 especially since LXX<sup>A</sup> lacks the underlying phrase ויששכר כן ברק. But LINDARS, *Judges*, 256, points out that the omission cannot represent the OG and its underlying Hebrew Vorlage because then, the subject of the following phrase would have been Deborah. Yet the masculine pronoun clearly presupposes Barak as subject. LXX<sup>B</sup>, on the other hand, does have the phrase, but substitutes Barak for Issachar so that Barak is mentioned twice and Issachar only once. LINDARS sees this reading also as an error resulting from the confusion in the Greek tradition. In addition, J. GRAY, "Israel", 434 n. 35; 437 n. 51, favours emending the second reference to Issachar to Naphtali so that the latter is also mentioned in vv. 14-17. However, as GRAY himself admits, this proposed emendation is conjectural and lacks support from the versions.

This suggests, therefore, that v. 14-15c and v. 15d-17 are constructed as parallel and contrasting panels<sup>(27)</sup>.

In fact, given that vv. 23-24 also seems to represent two parallel and contrasting panels in which a non-participating city is twice cursed while a participating individual is twice blessed, a case can be made that these two pairs of panels are structurally related. The fact that vv. 14-17 first mention the participating tribes and then the non-participating tribes, whereas the order is reversed in vv. 23-24 suggests that the two pairs of panels may constitute elements of a larger chiasmic structure<sup>(28)</sup>.

But if so, what is one to do with v. 18? Is it possible to detach it from the tribal roll call that immediately precedes and take the verse as belonging with what immediately follows in vv. 19-22? Granted, such an option is hardly ever entertained, but a closer examination reveals that it is not without merit.

To begin, although v. 18 is almost universally seen as part of the tribal roll call, a closer look reveals that there is a slight difference in emphasis between vv. 14-17 and v. 18. Following immediately after vv. 11d-13, where the recounting of the victories of YHWH and His people begins with the tribes going down to the gates to join Deborah and Barak, the initial focus of vv. 14-17 seems to be on the pre-battle arrival of the various tribes from their respective regions. This can be seen in the use of the *בן* preposition with three of the four tribes in v. 14, and in the repetition of *יֵרֵד*, which seems to provide a link back to vv. 11.13, where those heading out to battle first went down and gathered at the city gates. In v. 15a-c, further movement towards battle is detected as Issachar is described not only as being with Deborah and

<sup>(27)</sup> Incidentally, this understanding of vv. 14-15c and vv. 15d-17 as parallel panels would constitute a strong argument against the view of BLENKINSOPP, "Ballad Style", 71-72, that vv. 15d-16 was originally an independent taunt-song that was only later inserted into the original war ballad.

<sup>(28)</sup> If this understanding has merit, then it would effectively undermine the argument of VINCENT, "Song", 70, that the song consists of three main sections. For although VINCENT considers Judg 5.23-31 to be a third main section, arguing that, like the previous two sections, its opening is also marked by the presence of the root *בֵּרַךְ* in v. 24, it is clear that the pronouncement of blessing on Jael is significantly different from the call to bless YHWH in v. 2 and v. 9. In fact, given the strength of Vincent's earlier argument for v. 2 and v. 9 being refrains, and the fact that the cursing of Meroz and blessing of Jael seem intricately connected to the ongoing focus on participation versus non-participation, there is excellent reason to see the song as simply consisting of two main sections, each marked by a refrain at the section's opening.

Barak, but also as following Barak's lead in heading down into the valley where the battle would take place<sup>(29)</sup>. However, up to this point, actual engagement with the enemy has yet to occur.

But right at this point, when one almost expects next to hear about the battle itself, perhaps to create suspense, the battle scene is delayed as the focus suddenly shifts away from the activities of the participating tribes to those that had chosen a different response. Instead of volunteering themselves for battle, this second group of tribes chose to stay home. Here in vv. 15d-17, the verbs *ישב* and *שכן* appear twice and *גור* once, thus signalling an inactivity that contrasts with the previous group that came down (*ירד*) from their various regions<sup>(30)</sup>.

But if the focus of vv. 14-17 is indeed on the participation or lack thereof of the various tribes leading up to the actual battle, then a case can be made that the battle narrative actually begins in v. 18. For unlike vv. 14-17, the focus of v. 18 seems no longer to be just on the fact of participation leading up to battle but on the manner of participation during battle. After all, Zebulun and Naphtali are said in v. 18 to be scorning life to the point of death, and if that speaks of the tribes' valour, it is a valour observable mainly during battle and not before<sup>(31)</sup>. In fact, that such valour is specifically said to be

<sup>(29)</sup> It is noteworthy that in the prose account, Deborah apparently did not take part in the actual battle. After she gave the final rallying cry on Mount Tabor in Judg 4,14, it was only Barak and the ten thousand men with him who headed down into the valley to engage with the enemy. In this regard, one can argue that, even though Issachar is not specifically mentioned in Judges 4, the presence of the tribe with both Deborah and Barak and the subsequent mention of it heading down into the valley with Barak in Judg 5,15a-c may correlate with the precise moment depicted in Judg 4,14 leading up to the actual battle.

<sup>(30)</sup> Here, B. HALPERN, "The Resourceful Israelite Historian: The Song of Deborah and Israelite Historiography", *HTR* 76 (1983) 381-396, argues that the tribes in vv. 15d-17 are in fact not presented as refusing to participate, but as having participated in battle. But even if one grants some of HALPERN's arguments, it is still puzzling as to why normally static verbs like *ישב* and *שכן* would be used in v.17 to indicate participation. Besides, in a stanza that HALPERN himself notices is dominated by martial language, a lyrical understanding of these verses as focusing on the tribes' dwelling places seems out of place and lacking in harmony with the stanza's overall tenor.

<sup>(31)</sup> Here, *ונפתלי* in v. 18 is understood to imply that Naphtali also acted the same way as Zebulun did, scorning life to the point of death. The phrase *על מרומי שדה* is then understood as providing the setting where such acts of valour are displayed by both tribes during battle. Incidentally, this understanding of 5.18 as taking place during actual battle is also shared by A. GLOBE, "The Muster of the Tribes in Judges 5:11e-18", *ZAW* 87 (1975) 177.

demonstrated in “the heights of the field” further confirms that it is the tribes’ battle conduct that is in view. For not only is שדה often the place where battles are fought<sup>(32)</sup>, as Lindars points out, the very fact that the two tribes dared to come down and exposed themselves in open country, knowing that it would make them easy target for Sisera’s chariots, is what made their valour so commendable<sup>(33)</sup>. These observations thus seem to support the argument that, contrary to what most believe, the battle narrative actually does not begin at v. 19 but at v. 18.

To be sure, such an interpretation is open to being criticised as “hyper-literal”<sup>(34)</sup>. Halpern even argues that it is precisely such a literal interpretation of v. 18 that led the author of Judg 4 to wrongly infer that it is only Zebulun and Naphtali that participated in the actual battle<sup>(35)</sup>. But the insistence that v. 18 belongs with what precedes is also not without difficulty. For even if one grants Halpern’s contention that the tribes in vv. 15d-17 are presented not as refusing to participate but as participating, there is still the question of why commendations for Zebulun would occur in two separate places if vv. 14-18 actually constitutes a single rhetorical unit that focuses on all who participated. And if, contrary to Halpern, the tribes in vv. 15d-17 are in fact presented as refusing to participate, then it is even more puzzling that the two praises for Zebulun are separated both by Issachar, another participating tribe, and a list of non-participating tribes.

But this would no longer pose a problem if v. 18 is not counted as part of the preceding tribal roll call, but as part of the following battle narrative. For then, the twice mentioning of Zebulun can easily be explained since the second reference to the tribe with Naphtali in v. 18 marks a new rhetorical unit and thus serves a different rhetorical function from its earlier reference in v. 14<sup>(36)</sup>.

<sup>(32)</sup> See Josh 8,24; Judg 9,43-44; 20,31; 1 Sam 4,2; 14,15; 2 Sam 10,8; 11,23; 18,6. GRAY, “Israel”, 439, n. 60, actually sees the term as referring specifically to the battleground in this context.

<sup>(33)</sup> LINDARS, *Judges*, 264-265.

<sup>(34)</sup> R.S. KAWASHIMA, “From Song to Story: The Genesis of Narrative in Judges 4 and 5”, *Prooftexts* 21 (2001) 156.

<sup>(35)</sup> HALPERN, “Resourceful”, 390.

<sup>(36)</sup> Admittedly, this would still leave open the question as to why Naphtali has not been included in the tribal roll call of vv. 14-17. While no easy solution is available, perhaps the mention of Barak in v. 15 goes some distance towards filling the gap. After all, Barak was himself a Naphtalite, and in this respect, his presence could conceivably be seen as representative of the tribe’s participation.

Furthermore, an additional advantage in taking v. 18 with what follows is that it would then give the Israelite contingent a role in the actual battle narrative. Otherwise, the battle narrative usually seen as comprising vv. 19-22 would feature only natural forces against the enemy but would be devoid of human participants on the Israelite side. Given the emphasis throughout much of the song on the tribes' participation or lack thereof, plus the fact that it was actually the victories of both YHWH and His people that was being celebrated in v. 11c, it would be puzzling, to say the least, if the tribes that have featured so prominently before and after the battle narrative are actually not featured at all within the battle narrative<sup>(37)</sup>.

But if the battle narrative does begin with v. 18, then the two tribes participating valiantly on YHWH's side would provide the perfect human counterpart to the foreign kings in battle, while natural forces such as the stars and the Kishon River would function as a counterpart to the kings' horses. This would thus allow vv. 18-22 to be understood also as two parallel panels: vv. 18-19 focusing on the human participants in battle, and vv. 20-22 focusing on the non-human participants. And inasmuch as two tribes played a role in preventing the enemy kings from taking any plunder or silver, two natural forces also played a role in bringing the kings' horses, and by extension, their entire army, into disarray.

Taken together with the stanzas that immediately precede and follow, an overall chiasmic arrangement of three parallel panels encompassing the whole of vv. 14-24 can thus be seen as follows:

- A. Roll Call of tribes that participated in the military campaign (vv. 14-15a).
- B. Roll Call of tribes that refused to participate (vv. 15b-17).
  - C. Two tribes participated valiantly, such that the enemy kings did not prevail (vv. 18-19).
  - C'. Two forces of nature also played a role, such that even the kings' horses retreated in chaos (vv. 20-22).
- B'. Meroz twice cursed for refusing to help YHWH's cause against the enemy (v. 23).
- A'. Jael twice blessed, presumably for the part she played in killing the enemy leader (v. 24).

<sup>(37)</sup> In this regard, I beg to disagree with A.J. HAUSER, "Judges 5: Parataxis in Hebrew Poetry", *JBL* 99 (1980) 33, who explains the non-mention of the Israelites in the battle scene by asserting that since the battle is portrayed as cosmic, the assembled tribes can have no real impact on its outcome. If that were indeed true, then it would almost render the repeated censure for non-participation within the song entirely pointless.

Note, furthermore, that the beauty of such an arrangement is that in every section that makes up this chiastic structure, some form of doubling or pairing up of complementary elements is discernible. Thus, in A and B, the tribes Issachar and Reuben are both mentioned twice in their respective sections. In C and C', two participating tribes and two forces of nature, all fighting on YHWH's sides, are also brought into focus. Finally, in B' and A', Meroz and Jael are twice cursed and twice blessed respectively. Thus, in this understanding of the way vv. 14-24 is structured, the literary skill and artistry of the song's author is amply demonstrated<sup>(38)</sup>.

Incidentally, this new structural understanding of vv. 14-24 does not diminish at all the argument that a significant rhetorical purpose of the song is to serve as a polemic against non-participation. For although the structural centre for the section comprising vv. 14-24 is now focused on how human and non-human participants together contributed to victory over the enemy, the fact that this centre is flanked on both sides by references to those who did not participate, which in turn are bracketed by commendations of those who did, seem clearly to highlight participation versus non-participation as the single most significant issue within this section. In fact, one can argue that even the focus on the involvement of both human and non-human participants at the centre of this section is fundamentally polemical in purpose. For as has been pointed out earlier, if even nature participated together with humans to bring about a decisive victory against the enemy, then those who refused to participate and contribute to such a victory for YHWH's cause are indeed justifiably rebuked and cursed.

So far, in the above attempt to argue that a significant rhetorical purpose of Deborah's song is polemical, I have shown that the refrain in v. 2 and v. 9 as well as a substantial portion of the song in vv. 10-24 seem to focus on the tribes' participation or lack thereof. But is the remaining material within the song compatible with such a polemical reading?

In the first major section of the song in vv. 2-8, after the opening refrain in v. 2 and the call to listen in v. 3 as praises are sung to YHWH, vv. 4-5 is generally regarded as depicting YHWH's theophany. Admittedly, in this theophanic description, there is neither explicit

<sup>(38)</sup> Note too, that this repetitive doubling or pairing up of complementary elements also fit well with what one would expect of compositions that were initially passed on orally, such as a song. For such features would facilitate memorisation before the composition was recorded in writing.



depiction of YHWH as a warrior nor any clear suggestion that the coming of YHWH is specifically for the purpose of war<sup>(39)</sup>. Yet many think that in the context of the song, the theophany is nonetheless intended to depict YHWH as marching ahead of His people into battle against the enemy<sup>(40)</sup>. After all, the storm imagery in v. 4 does seem to anticipate the rain and the sudden flooding of the Kishon that play such a significant role in the actual battle narrative<sup>(41)</sup>. If so, one can conceivably argue that even this theophany has a specific role to play in the overall polemic against non-participation. For if YHWH is depicted at the outset as leading the way in battle against the enemy, then there is no excuse for any of His people not to be similarly involved.

As for vv. 6-8, it is generally agreed that these verses function mainly to provide the setting for the ensuing battle, revealing the harsh conditions Israel had to face prior to battle<sup>(42)</sup>. But here again, one can argue that even such background information contributes to the polemic against non-participation. For if living conditions in the nation were indeed as appalling as what is described, then it almost makes it incumbent upon all in Israel to join in the effort to put an end to the misery brought on by foreign oppression. The refusal of any tribe or city to participate would thus be seen once again as inexcusable in light of the nation's suffering.

Regarding vv. 25-27, it has already been pointed out earlier that this description of how Jael managed to kill Sisera is actually intricately tied to the pronouncement of blessing upon her in v. 24. After all, while the reason for cursing Meroz is explicitly stated in v.

<sup>(39)</sup> Compare with the explicit warrior language found in Exod 15,3.6-10 and especially in Psalm 68, where vv. 7-8 is actually substantially similar to Judg 5,4-5. A. GLOBE, "The Text and Literary Structure of Judges 5,4-5", *Bib* 55 (1974) 178 argues, however, that since צִבְיָה and צִבְיָה are found in military contexts elsewhere in Hebrew scripture, YHWH is clearly envisaged as a warrior.

<sup>(40)</sup> See, for example, BOLING, *Judges*, 108; HAUSER, "Parataxis", 29-30; "Two Songs", 269, 271; BLOCK, *Judges*, 222. While SOGGIN, *Judges*, 84, sees the description as essentially confessional rather than referring to a specific battle, he nonetheless sees it as a confession of faith in the God who fights alongside His people whenever that seems necessary.

<sup>(41)</sup> GLOBE, "Literary Structure", 504, even implies a more direct relationship between the two as he sees v. 4d-e at the formal centre of the strophe as describing the very means of YHWH's intervention in the battle. Likewise, A.G. AULD, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth*, (Louisville 1984) 158, sees these early words as directing us to see YHWH's hand in vv. 20-21.

<sup>(42)</sup> See, for example, BLENKINSOPP, "Ballad Style", 69; LINDARS, *Judges*, 234; BLOCK, *Judges*, 224.

23, the reason for the corresponding pronouncement of blessing on Jael is not provided in v. 24 but only in vv. 25-27. For this reason, most in fact see vv. 24-27 as a single rhetorical unit.

But while there is no denying that vv. 25-27 must logically be seen as a continuation of v. 24, I have, however, separated the two in the above analysis for the following reasons.

First, while the reason for cursing Meroz in v. 23 is relatively straightforward and succinctly put, the reason for the pronouncement of blessing on Jael is less direct and given in much greater detail. Therefore, if vv. 24-27 is taken as a single rhetorical unit, it would result in an imbalance in the final two panels of the larger chiasmic structure proposed above since vv. 24-27 would be significantly longer than v. 23.

But second, it is also noteworthy that vv. 25-27 actually seems to be structured as some kind of parallel with vv. 28-30. After all, the main character in both these stanzas is a woman, and in both cases, it is the respective woman's actions or thoughts in relation to Sisera that is in view. Furthermore, if O'Connell is right in that the giving of milk to Sisera by Jael is intended to portray her as a mother figure, then we have in the two stanzas the portrayal of a mother figure who kills and a birth mother who waits<sup>(43)</sup>. And ironically, in this case, it is the mother figure who kills that is celebrated, while the birth mother who waits is mocked for her naivety.

In fact, one can even make a case that, taken together with v. 31a-b, the two panels comprising vv. 25-27 and vv. 28-30 can also be arranged chiasmically. For if Jael, by her action, represents those who love YHWH, while Sisera's mother represents YHWH's enemies, then the following chiasmic structure is possible:

- A. The triumph of those who love YHWH demonstrated (vv. 25-27).
- B. The dashed hopes of YHWH's enemies demonstrated (vv. 28-30).
- B'. The destruction of YHWH's enemies proclaimed (v. 31a).
- A'. The glory of those who love YHWH proclaimed (v. 31b).

In any case, what the above seems to show is that vv. 25-27 may in fact function as a hinge stanza that is linked both to what immediately precedes in v. 24 and to what immediately follows in vv. 28-30. And to the extent that it functions as a pivot between two subsections of the song that otherwise have no direct relationship with each other, it is

<sup>(43)</sup> O'CONNELL, *Judges*, 123. While חלב can also refer to fat and is not often associated with nursing imagery, Isa 28,9; 60,16 does lend some support to O'Connell's assertion.

probably best to recognize its transitional character by detaching it from v. 24, notwithstanding its close logical relationship with the latter.

But even so, because vv. 25-27 does provide the primary reason for the pronouncement of blessing on Jael, and this reason, having to do with her killing of Sisera, seems to provide evidence of her participation on Israel's side against the enemy, vv. 25-27 can certainly be said to play a crucial role in setting up a legitimate contrast between the non-participating Meroz and the participating Jael. In this regard, one can therefore say that vv. 25-27 also contributes significantly to the polemic against non-participation.

As for the entire chiastic arrangement comprising vv. 25-31, although here, the polemic seems to be directed against the enemy rather than against non-participating Israelites, the fact that vv. 25-27 is at the same time intricately tied to both what precedes and what follows opens up interesting possibilities. For if that blessed act of participation on the part Jael is indeed set as a contrast both to those in Israel who did not participate and to the enemies of YHWH, then it raises the question of whether the non-participating Israelites who have already been cursed would in the end suffer the same fate as those who are regarded as enemies of YHWH. While this question is left essentially unanswered as the song draws to a close, the nagging possibility that this may indeed be the case perhaps offers the strongest polemic by far against non-participation.

From the above analysis, we can conclude that structurally, the bulk of the Song of Deborah can be seen as consisting of parallel yet contrasting binary panels. Furthermore, through careful juxtaposing, the author of the song has arranged these panels so that when viewed in relation to each other, several of them can be grouped into larger concentric units. While in doing so, the song's author has undoubtedly demonstrated his significant literary skill and artistry, even more impressive is the fact that through this intricate structure, he has managed also to reveal a significant rhetorical purpose that underlies his composition. For by making the celebration of participation his main theme in the refrain that introduces each major section of the song, by constantly drawing attention to and praising all who participated in battle, be they divine, natural, or human participants who participated on a tribal or individual basis, and by repeatedly setting up for deliberate contrast those in Israel who participated versus those who refused to do so, the author has effectively turned what looks on the surface like a victory song into something far more

politically charged: a polemic against non-participation on the part of those who should have participated in military campaigns against foreign enemies but did not. In fact, to the extent that this focus on participation versus non-participation seems to permeate the entire song and can adequately relate to and explain the inclusion of every subsection within the song, whereas one would be hard pressed to explain the lack of prominence given to YHWH and the focus on the non-participants in war if the song was written simply to praise YHWH in a victory celebration, one can argue that the primary rhetorical purpose of the song is actually polemical rather than celebratory. To be sure, the author may have taken advantage of the occasion of a victory celebration and dressed his composition up in celebratory garb, but the content and literary structure that supports it seem to point clearly to a fundamentally polemic purpose.

### *3. The Song of Deborah as Polemic: Some Implications*

Such a conclusion, if sustainable, has certain implications for two issues of ongoing debate: the relationship between the prose account in Judg 4 and the song in Judg 5, and the possible date of composition for the song itself.

Regarding the relationship between the prose account in Judg 4 and the song in Judg 5, it is noteworthy that, if a strong polemic against non-participation indeed suffuses the Song of Deborah, that same polemic is entirely absent in the prose account in Judg 4. Thus, for all the debate about whether it is the prose account that is dependent on the song or vice versa, the apparent divergence in rhetorical purpose for the two accounts raises a third possibility that neither account is actually derived from the other, but that each was independently composed for its own specific purpose. After all, if the prose account was indeed derived from the song and motivated by a desire to fill in apparent gaps so as to provide a more complete and coherent picture<sup>(44)</sup>, then it is somewhat curious that the polemic against non-participation so prominent in the song would be left out entirely in the prose account. Conversely, since a significant focus of the song that certain Israelite tribes and cities had been expected to participate in the war against Sisera but did not is information extraneous to the prose account, that makes it unlikely that the prose account had been the main source of information behind the composition of the song.

(44) See HALPERN, "Resourceful", 379-401; KAWASHIMA, "Song", 151-178.

Regarding that last point, to be sure, Levin dismisses the references to the non-participants as later additions and sees the information regarding the participating tribes not mentioned in Judges 4 as having been derived from the preceding narrative about Ehud and from Josh 17<sup>(45)</sup>. In doing so, Levin seems to imply that the core of the song was composed after the narratives of the various judges (or at the very least, the Ehud and Deborah-Barak narratives) have already been compiled into some kind of continuous narrative. But if so, then why compose a thanksgiving song only for the deliverance under Deborah and Barak and not for the other deliverances? And why would later redactors feel the need to add further material to explain the absence of certain tribes from this particular war alone when in subsequent wars led by other judges such as Gideon and Jephthah, even fewer tribes were involved with no explanations given for their absences?

Thus, all things considered, what is more likely is that both prose and poetic accounts were based on essentially the same source material or had similar knowledge of the same historical event, but that each author had independently chosen to include different details to fit his specific rhetorical goal. Incidentally, such a conclusion actually coincides with that drawn by Younger on the basis of his analysis of other parallel prose and poetic accounts in the ancient Near East<sup>(46)</sup>.

But if the Song of Deborah was indeed composed independently of the prose account primarily as a polemic against Israelite non-participation in military campaigns against external enemies, then the next logical question, which has implications for the date of composition for the song, should concern the ostensible setting under which an author would be motivated to compose such a song.

Clearly, one possibility would be that the song was in fact composed shortly after the events referred to, so that the polemic was indeed directed against the non-participants in the war against Sisera.

Another possibility would be that the song was composed by none other than the author/redactor of the book of Judges, since the polemic so prominent in the song actually contributes to two ongoing motifs within the book having to do with increasing reluctance on the part of Israelite tribes and cities to participate in liberation wars and a

<sup>(45)</sup> LEVIN, "Das Alter", 128-130, 136-137.

<sup>(46)</sup> K.L. YOUNGER, JR., "Heads! Tails! Or the Whole Coin?! Contextual Method & Intertextual Analysis: Judges 4 and 5", *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective* (ed. K.L. YOUNGER, JR. – W.W. HALLO – B.F. BATTO) (Scripture in Context IV; Lampeter 1991) 135.

corresponding increase in harshness on the part of Israel's judges in response to that reluctance<sup>(47)</sup>. That having said, however, one should also note that even though the motivation was present for the author/redactor of the book to compose a song the polemic of which fits perfectly into the rhetorical schema he was constructing for the book as a whole, it is nonetheless inexplicable that he would resort to an elaborate piece of poetry when it would have been far easier for him to work that polemic into the prose account. Thus, it seems more likely that the author/redactor of Judges in fact did not compose the song himself, but was incorporating into his work a pre-existing composition that happened to fit his overall rhetorical goal.

Still other ostensible settings have been proposed for the Song of Deborah. Soggin and Lindars, for example, both favour an early monarchical setting for the song on the basis of linguistic evidence<sup>(48)</sup>. Levin, on the other hand, furnishing both linguistic and literary arguments, favours a post-exilic date of composition<sup>(49)</sup>. While detailed discussion of these and other proposals may have to await a more opportune time, what needs be pointed out, however, is that in evaluating the relative merits of any proposal related to date of composition, other than linguistic and literary considerations, one should also not overlook the importance of a credible real-life setting from which a composition might arise, given what can be discerned about its rhetorical purpose.

Thus, for our current discussion, for example, if the main rhetorical purpose of the Song of Deborah is indeed to serve as a polemic against Israelite non-participation in military campaigns against external enemies, then it would render it less likely that the song might have been composed during the early monarchy. For evidence from the book of Samuel seems to suggest that during that period, Israelites and their tribes were generally united behind their kings and were willing and frequent participants in military campaigns against foreign enemies<sup>(50)</sup>. While to be sure, isolated exceptions must have existed, these do not

(47) For more details regarding the role the Song of Deborah plays in the portrayal of deterioration within the book of Judges, see G.T.K. WONG, *The Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges*. An Inductive, Rhetorical Study (VTS 111; Leiden 2006) 176-180.

(48) SOGGIN, *Judges*, 80-81, 93-94; LINDARS, *Judges*, 213-215.

(49) LEVIN "Das Alter", 124-141.

(50) See, for example, 1 Sam 11,6-8; 14,20-22; 17,1-3; 28,4; 2 Sam 10,7-19; 11,1; 24,1-9.

seem to have been sufficiently widespread both to warrant the composition of such a polemical piece and to account for its ready acceptance by that generation so that it would gain sufficient popularity to be preserved as one the nation's enduring traditions. This is especially so since by the time of the early monarchy, the events narrated in the song would have been in the distance past already, and the stances taken by the various tribes towards military campaigns against foreign enemies may have substantially changed from the time of Deborah. Therefore unless the subject matter of the song in some way corresponds to certain prevailing contemporary attitude that is widely deemed to require addressing, it would be unlikely that antiquated polemics would be capable of generating enough interest to warrant the level of repetition that would eventually result in the song's preservation as an enduring tradition.

In this regard, it should be noted that although considerations of the rhetorical purpose of a composition may not be sufficient to pinpoint an exact date of composition, it does, however, contribute to the discussion of what is plausible and what is less so in one's attempt to identify a specific setting for a particular literary composition.

Flat 1F2 – 20 Livingstone Place  
Edinburgh EH9 1PD – U.K.

Gregory T.K. WONG

#### SUMMARY

Focusing on its rhetorical structure, this article argues that the Song of Deborah in Judg 5 may have been composed not so much primarily to celebrate a victory, but to serve as a polemic against Israelite non-participation in military campaigns against foreign enemies. Possible implications of such a reading on the song's relationship with the prose account in Judg 4 and its date of composition are also explored.



## What Shall We Do? The Community Rules of Thomas in the 'Fifth Gospel'

The *Logia* tradition in the *Gospel of Thomas* contains various institutional regulations that depict not only the genesis of the Thomas people, but also their autonomous beliefs and life within the broad Jesus movement. What was, then, the functional role of the Jesus *Logia* in the early Christian group? The community rules in the Thomas text are not organised in a systematic way, but are mixed with other *Logia* that have a different textual purpose. The Jewish traditions were partly quoted by the Logiographer of the text, but the anti-Christian rituals were rejected or reinterpreted in terms of the primary requirements of entering the community or maintaining the idiosyncratic identification of the new Christian movement within the Jewish-dominated environment. The interpretation of the community rules will be discussed in the view of a domestic concern, which substantiates not only the Thomasine community conflicting with Judaism, but also the self-governing ability, indicating the growth and development of the movement.

The Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) contain several types of doctrinal scrolls, which justify the survival of the Qumran community in the desert of Judea in the pre-Jewish War period of the first century C.E. The isolated Jewish community kept the regular rules to maintain the unknown group in peace; this is apparently proven in the scrolls called *The Community Rules*. The scrolls 1QS, 4Q 255-264 and 5Q 11<sup>(1)</sup>, written by the Masters or Guardians of the community, are about "statutes concerned with initiation into the sect and with its common life, organisation and discipline, a penal code, liturgical ceremonies, the fundamental religious duties of the Master and his disciples"<sup>(2)</sup>.

(1) The texts of 4Q 280, 286-287, 4Q 502 and 5Q 13 are also regarded as the community rules of the Qumran community.

(2) The major part of the community scrolls were discovered in the form of a parchment scroll in Cave 1 of the Qumran site. The fragments of twelve other manuscripts were also found in Caves 4 and 5. G. VERMES, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London 1998) 97-98, 99-239. L. ROST, *Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon. An Introduction to the Documents* (Nashville 1976) 164-169. J. CAMPBELL, "The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rules", *JTS* 51 (2000) 628-631.

The sectarian rules that the Qumran people followed represented one of the ways they kept the community united, through transmitting the unique tradition to the following generations: “The Master shall teach ... to live, according to the *Book of the Community Rules*, that they may seek God with a whole heart and soul, and do what is good and right before Him (God)” (1QS 1 1-4)<sup>(3)</sup>. In the same way, an early Christian literature, called the *Didache*<sup>(4)</sup>, that, according to Robinson, was written between 40-60 C.E., is composed of the “church orders” of a Jewish-Christian community (in the environment of Antioch)<sup>(5)</sup>. The *Didache* comprises Christian belief and ethics based on the traditional Jewish customs, as shown in the five distinct sections: the moral exhortations that are from the Jewish traditions and Christian sayings (Chs. 1–6)<sup>(6)</sup>; the rituals of the community that are the Eucharist with the addition of the Jewish practices of “praying, fasting and almsgiving”, and “water baptism” in the Name of the “Trinity” (Chs. 7–10)<sup>(7)</sup>; guidelines for receiving apostles, prophets, teachers, church leaders (bishops and deacons) and travelling Christians (Chs. 11–15)<sup>(8)</sup>; teachings about the Christian view of the eschatological

<sup>(3)</sup> VERMES, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 98.

<sup>(4)</sup> The *Didache* is the reconstructed title by modern scholars. The text was originally called *The Teachings of the Apostles*.

<sup>(5)</sup> While many readers agree on the origin of the text as being between 50-150 C.E., Milavec, who claims the period of 50-70 C.E., supports the view of Robinson in the context that the text simply presents the necessary rules of a Christian community. J.A. ROBINSON, *Reading the New Testament* (London 1976) 323-358. A. MILAVEC, *The Didache. Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Minnesota 2003). T.M. FINN, *From Death to Rebirth. Ritual and Conversion in Antiquity* (New York – Mahwah 1997) 146-149. J. RENDEL HARRIS, *The Teaching of the Apostles* (London – Baltimore 1887).

<sup>(6)</sup> J. REED, “The Hebrew Epic and the Didache”, *The Didache in Context. Essays on Its Texts, History and Transmission* (ed. C.N. JEFFORD) (Leiden – New York – Köln 1995) 215-225.

<sup>(7)</sup> C.N. JEFFORD, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teachings of the Twelve Apostles* (Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1989) 1-139. N. MITCHELL, “Baptism in the Didache”, *The Didache in Context*, 226-229.

<sup>(8)</sup> S.J. PATTERSON, “Didache 11–13: The Legacy of Radical Itinerancy in Early Christianity”, *The Didache in Context*, 313-329. M. SLEE, *The Church in Antioch in the First Century CE. Community and Conflict* (JSNTSS 244; London – New York 2003) 101-116. J.A. DRAPER, “Social Ambiguity and the Production of Text: Prophets, Teachers, Bishops, and Deacons and the Development of the Jesus Tradition in the Community of the Didache”, *The Didache in Context*, 284-312.

events (Ch. 16)<sup>(9)</sup>. The members of the community were mainly the convicted Jews, so they continued to keep the Mosaic Law for the reason that reading the whole Hebrew Canon was not countered to their relationship with Jesus. This aspect of the positive Jewish tradition unveils the fact that the *Didache*-people interpreted the “Torah of Messiah” in a Christian sight of hope<sup>(10)</sup>. If the above two groups of Qumran and *Didache* themselves designed and practised their own community axiom for the continuity of the religious societies, the fact that the Thomas *Logia* of Jesus includes a form of regulations for its own commitment to the foundation, should not be denied or ignored.

### 1. The Family Rules

In this respect, many words of the Thomasine Jesus display the limitations of the community faith or life. The conditional terminologies of “ΠΕΤΑ (whoever)”, “ΖΟΤΑΝ (when)”, “Ε... ΩΑΝ (if)”, “ΤΡΕ (let)” and “ΩΑΝΤΕ (until)”, have joined with the standard of the community rules. Firstly, the relationship between “ΤΡΕΩΜΕ Ν•ΖΛΛΟ (the old man)” and “ΟΥ•ΚΟΥΕΙ Ν•ΩΗΡΕ ΩΗΜ (a small child)”<sup>(11)</sup>, in a family concept, is quite similar to the precept of loving “ΠΕΚ•ΟΝ (your brother)”<sup>(12)</sup>, although it seems to have a spiritual meaning to the complier of the text<sup>(13)</sup>. The rule of the brotherhood is repeatedly emphasised in the following *Logion*, for example, “When you cast the beam out of your own eye, then you will see clearly to cast the mote

<sup>(9)</sup> According to ideological readers, the text can also be divided in various ways. D. BURKETT, *An Introduction to the New Testament and the Origins of Christianity* (Cambridge 2002) 396-403.

<sup>(10)</sup> The Prayer of the Lord (*Did* 8,2), false prophets (*Did* 11,3), correcting another (*Did* 15,3), and alms, prayers, and fasting (*Did* 15,4) are similar to Matt 6,9-13, 7,15; 5,21-22 and 6,1-6. This paper will not explore this area further. See J.A. DRAPER, “The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*”, *Gospel Perspectives*. The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels (ed. D. WENHAM) (Sheffield 1985) V, 269-287. W. RORDORF, “Does the *Didache* Contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?”, *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (ed. H. WANSBROUGH) (JSNTSS 64; Sheffield 1991) 394-423.

<sup>(11)</sup> *Logion* 4.

<sup>(12)</sup> *Logion* 25.

<sup>(13)</sup> This *Logion* relates the standard of one’s self-consciousness and the experiential world of those for whom Thomas was proposed. H.-J. KLAUCK, *The Religious Context of Early Christianity*. A Guide to Graeco-Roman Religions (Edinburgh 2000) 112.

from your brother's eye"<sup>(14)</sup>. The scenario of a conflict between brothers of a family when dividing their father's possessions<sup>(15)</sup>, is negatively responded by Jesus, but draws on useful advice that the children of a family should co-operate with each other and keep a peaceful relationship. "[The foxes have their holes] and the birds have their nests, but the son of man has no place to lay his head and rest"<sup>(16)</sup>, consistently manifests the importance of "family" or "house" in a metaphorical way<sup>(17)</sup>, despite Jacobson's supposition that the "Thomas version of the Jesus movement includes homeless wanderers with no place to rest"<sup>(18)</sup>.

Such positive family rules of the religious society are composed vaguely with anti-family sources. "The disparity and heterogeneity of the (two) contents" often lead readers to abandon the possibility of understanding the internal coherence<sup>(19)</sup>. Nevertheless, since the writings of Q, such as Q 9,57b-58; Q 9,59-60; Q 12,51-53 and Q 14,26<sup>(20)</sup>, witness the dissolution of family ties, the anti-family rules of Thomas should not be treated in a literary context, but in their socio-religious context. This way of thinking is quite reasonable, if one seriously considers Patterson's approach of "moving from the text to social reality"<sup>(21)</sup>. In this case, the above positive family rules were seen by those who were already in the Thomasine community as the moral attitudes towards other people. In the meantime, the anti-family

<sup>(14)</sup> *Logion* 26.

<sup>(15)</sup> "Tell my brothers to divide my father's possessions with me. He (Jesus) said to him, O man, who has made me a divider?" (*Logion* 72).

<sup>(16)</sup> *Logion* 86.

<sup>(17)</sup> This *Logion* is matched with Q 9,58. However, since the author of Q expresses 'the son of humanity' as the subject, the word, 'the son of man' in Thomas can be interpreted in various ways. R. DORAN, "The Divinization of Disorder: The Trajectory of Matt 8: 20 // Luke 9: 58 // Gos. Thom. 86", *The Future of Early Christianity*. Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester (ed. B.A. PEARSON) (Minneapolis 1991) 210-219.

<sup>(18)</sup> A.D. JACOBSON, "Jesus Against the Family: The Dissolution of Family Ties in the Gospel Tradition", *From Quest to Q* (eds. J.M. ASGEIRSSON – K. DE TROYER – M.W. MEYER) (Leuven 2000) 216.

<sup>(19)</sup> See B. LINCOLN, "Thomas-Gospel and Thomas-Community: A New Approach to a Familiar Text", *NT* 4 (1977) 65-66.

<sup>(20)</sup> Q 10,4; 12,22-32, 16,13; 16,18 are also related to, or imply the anti-family ties.

<sup>(21)</sup> See S.J. PATTERSON, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma 1993). A.D. JACOBSON, "Jesus Against the Family: The Dissolution of Family Ties in the Gospel Tradition", *From Quest to Q*, 189.

sayings were for those who had just been converted or were in the transitional process from the traditional religion of the Jews (Judaism). The psychological sacrifice of leaving their family was the obvious obstacle during the time of crossing the boundary of the religious life<sup>(22)</sup>. The anti-family sayings functioned fundamentally to encourage the new proselytisers on how to handle their former family issues. Lincoln assumed that there was a division in the community between insiders and outsiders, in terms of these family rules<sup>(23)</sup>. Nevertheless, the gnostic hypothesis of Lincoln, which is based in Edessa in the second-century C.E., is not certain about the identities of “outsider” and “insider” (who were outsiders, and who were insiders?). Therefore, the community instructions about the anti-family ties, for new proselytisers of the Jesus religion, should be regarded as an indication of the “ascetic character” of the Gospel<sup>(24)</sup>.

The phrase “for there will be five in a house ... the father against the son, and the son against the father”<sup>(25)</sup>, shows family discord between the father and the son. This anti-family saying of Jesus designates “those who have been compelled to break away from their Jewish family to become followers of Jesus in the Thomasine community”<sup>(26)</sup>. Valantasis focused on the part of “they will stand solitary”, insisting that “the plural form leads to a solitary or unified community understanding so that the group appears as a corporate and unified entity consisting of multiple parts”<sup>(27)</sup>. If Valantasis’ interpretation is correct, the word “solitary (μοναχος)” of the *Logion* 16, which “refers to those who have faced conflicts against their

(22) This is obvious in the middle of the first century C.E. in which Jews and Romans hated Christians. They did not worship God together, even though the beginning of the new movement (30-40 C.E.) was not similar to the period before the Jewish war (50-70 C.E.). The fact that the Christian persecution was not organised by Romans themselves, but was plotted by Jews, displays the emotional level of the Jews.

(23) LINCOLN, “Thomas-Gospel and Thomas-Community”, 65-76.

(24) Yet, to evaluate the whole text as ascetic character, is an irresponsible risk without evidence. R. URO, “Is Thomas an Encratite Gospel?”, *Thomas at the Crossroads. Essays on the Gospel of Thomas* (ed. R. URO) (Edinburgh 1998) 140-162.

(25) The *Logion* 16 is similar to Q 12,51-53.

(26) R. URO, “Asceticism and Anti-Familial Language in the Gospel of Thomas”, *Constructing Early Christian Families. Family as Social Reality and Metaphor* (ed. H. MOXNES) (London – New York 1997) 216-234. Id., “Is Thomas an Encratite Gospel?”, 159.

(27) R. VALANTASIS, *The Gospel of Thomas* (London – New York 1997) 84.

(Jewish) households”, relates to the true identity of the (Thomas) disciples<sup>(28)</sup>. This view is amplified in the *Logia* 55 and 101 in which the necessary requirement for being the followers of Jesus was leaving their Jewish family: “ΠΕΡ ΕΙΩΤ (his father)”, “ΤΕΡ ΜΑΔΥ (his mother)”, “ΝΕΡ CΝΗΥ (his brothers)” and “ΝΕΡ CΩΝΕ (his sisters)”<sup>(29)</sup>. The writings of Q 12,49-53 and Q 14,26 also contain these ascetic sayings, in revealing the idea of “true motherhood”<sup>(30)</sup>.

Jesus’ denial of His physical mother and brothers, in the episode of *Logion* 99, is likely to be accorded with the concept of “anti-motherhood”, in that “blessed are the womb which bore you (Jesus) and the breasts which nourished you (Jesus)”, is corrected as “blessed are the womb which has not conceived and the breasts which have not given milk”<sup>(31)</sup>. Uro asserts that these community rules do not externally prohibit the experience of marriage and childbearing, but in terms of becoming community novices they implant a meaning of “true discipleship” that is above “maternal honour”<sup>(32)</sup>. The mutual saying of “those here who do the will of My Father are My brothers and My mother” expresses the spiritual “familyship”, and is supported by Jacobson, who contends that “the members of the Jesus movement formed a fictive family, devoted to doing the will of God”<sup>(33)</sup>. The provoking words, “He who knows the father and the mother will be called the son of a harlot”<sup>(34)</sup>, represent, likewise, another anti-family

<sup>(28)</sup> URO, ‘Is Thomas an Encratite Gospel?’, 158-160.

<sup>(29)</sup> “Whoever does not hate his father and his mother cannot become a disciple to me. And whoever does not hate his brothers and sisters and take up his cross in my way will not be worthy of me” (*Logion* 55). “Whoever does not hate his [father] and his mother as I do cannot become a [disciple] to me. And whoever does [not] love his [father and] and his mother as I do cannot become a [disciple to] me” (*Logion* 101). In interpreting these two similar *Logia*, Quispel argues that Thomas used at least two written sources, one Jewish-Christian and the other encratite. Quoted by Ibid., 145-146. In addition, “For my mother [ ... ], but [my] true [mother] gave me life”, is quite mystical, unless “[my] true [mother]” means ‘His heavenly Father, God’, in relation to Jesus’ heavenly origin.

<sup>(30)</sup> Q is not recognised as gnostic among modern readers. “... for I have come to divide son against father, and daughter against her mother, and daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law” (Q 12,49-53). “(The one who) does not hate father and mother (can) not (be) my (disciple); and (the one who does not hate) son and daughter cannot be my disciple” (Q 14,26).

<sup>(31)</sup> *Logion* 79.

<sup>(32)</sup> URO, “Is Thomas an Encratite Gospel?”, 140-162. ID., “Asceticism and Anti-Familial Language”, 216-234.

<sup>(33)</sup> JACOBSON, “Jesus Against the Family”, 216.

<sup>(34)</sup> *Logion* 105.

saying from the Thomas text that does not present any favouritism towards the former (Jewish) family life. These community rules are obviously factors representing the significant value of the religio-ideological family concept in the early Christian community<sup>(35)</sup>.

## 2. *The Anti-Jewish Rules*

Secondly, the various anti-Jewish rules illustrate not only that the group of Thomas, in the beginning, was created by Jewish proselytisers, but also that the community leader, for its own policy, activated the anti-Judaism campaign through the traditional rituals. Marjanen's statement that "first-century ... Christianity reacted in various ways to the central religious practices of the Jewish faith as it gradually separated from its mother religion and sought to find its own identity"<sup>(36)</sup>, this confirms with the *Logion* in which the Jewish leaders are seen as selfish and bigoted people: "The Pharisees and the Scribes have received the keys of knowledge (*gnosis*), they have hidden them. They did not enter, and they did not let those (enter) who wished"<sup>(37)</sup>. The Logiographer of the text characterises these Jewish leaders as "permanent outsiders" or "the opponents of the truth". The insight of Valantasis, that the phrase of "([You], however, [be as wise as serpents and as] innocent [as doves])"<sup>(38)</sup> is advice to the readers of Thomas, strengthens the community attitude of Thomas against those formalists. The image of the obstinate Jewish leadership is mentioned in Q 11,52<sup>(39)</sup>, in which "τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς γνώσεως (the keys of

<sup>(35)</sup> The view of the Thomasine Family rule, for Uro, is seen as "the true (divine) family lineage". R. URO, "The Social World of the Gospel of Thomas", *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity*. The Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas (ed. J.M. ASGEIRSSON – A.D. DECONICK – R. URO) (Leiden – Boston 2006) 26-28.

<sup>(36)</sup> A. MARJANEN, "Thomas and Jewish Religious Practices", *Thomas at the Crossroads*, 163.

<sup>(37)</sup> *Logion* 39 is presented in both Greek and Coptic texts: P. Oxy. 655 col. ii. 11-23 and NHC II, 2. 40: 07-13. If the word of 'keys of knowledge' was attractive to gnostic readers only, "the knowledge of the secrets of the kingdom of heaven" in Matthew 13,11 and Luke 8,10, and "... you have taken away the key to knowledge. You yourselves have not entered, and you have hindered those who were entering" in Luke 11,52, should be accepted as gnostic sayings as well.

<sup>(38)</sup> VALANTASIS, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 48.

<sup>(39)</sup> "Woe to you, exegetes of the Law, for you shut the kingdom of (God) from people; you did not go, nor let in those trying to get in", J.M. ROBINSON, *The Sayings of Jesus*. The Sayings Gospel Q in English (Minneapolis 2002) 18.



knowledge)” of *Logion* 39 (P. Oxy. 655.ii.14-15) is replaced by “τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ (θεοῦ) (the kingdom of [God])”<sup>(40)</sup>. The Jewish leaders (especially, Pharisees) in *Logion* 102 are metaphorically portrayed as “a sleeping dog in the manger of oxen”. The offensive attitude of the Jews leads others to a future without hope, in the sense that it depicts the irreverent effort for salvation. The rebuking scene of Jesus over the disciples (*Logion* 43b)<sup>(41)</sup> consistently shows that the customary Jewish mentality of being a person with a dual personality is not necessary in the community life of Thomas.

Another anti-Jewish rule that appeared in the picture relates to the Jewish practices of “ἐ...ΝΗCΤΕΥΕ (fasting)”, “ἐ...ΨΑΛΗ (praying)” and “ἐ...ΕΛΕΗΜΟCΥΝΗ (almsgiving)”<sup>(42)</sup>. These practices were ideologically reinterpreted because of their formalism. This does not mean that these religious activities themselves were useless; it was more a matter of the untruthful attitudes of the practitioners. The response of Jesus in His saying from *Logion* 6, “Do not lie; and do not do what you hate, for all things are manifest before Heaven”<sup>(43)</sup>, does not defend the methodological questions of His disciples on “ἐ...ΝΗCΤΕΥΕ (fasting)”, “ἐ...ΨΑΛΗ (praying)” and “ἐ...ΕΛΕΗΜΟCΥΝΗ (almsgiving)”; rather, it designates the formal behaviours of the religious rituals. The policy of the anti-Jewish rule is emphasised even more strongly in *Logion* 14a; “If you fast, you will give rise to sin for yourselves; and if you pray, you will be condemned; and if you give alms, you will do harm to your spirits”<sup>(44)</sup>. These hypocritical practices are not only avoided, but also penalised with a heavy punishment, if one takes note of the conditional structure of “ἐ... ΨΑΛΗ (if)” in the reading. Yet, the Thomas text (*Logion* 27a) proves the truthful activities have meanings in the sight of the

<sup>(40)</sup> It is better to understand that the terms “keys”, “knowledge” and “secret words” were quoted later by gnostic forerunners.

<sup>(41)</sup> “But you have become like the Jews, for they (either) love the tree and hate its fruit (or) love the fruit and hate the tree”.

<sup>(42)</sup> The combination of the three religious practices, which are also in the *Book of Tobit* (12,8), implies that its origin belongs to the Jewish ethical tradition. MARJANEN, “Thomas and Jewish Religious Practices”, 167.

<sup>(43)</sup> See also “For there is nothing hidden that shall not be revealed and there is nothing covered that shall remain without being uncovered”.

<sup>(44)</sup> The view that the question of *Logion* 6.1, in a way, seems to be answered in the *Logion* 14:1-3, is interpreted in many ways among Thomas readers, such as the organisational matter of Quispel for *Logion* 5, Davies’ suggestion of the mistake of ‘a tired scribe’, and Pearson’s accident theory. MARJANEN, “Thomas and Jewish Religious Practices”, 167-168. S.L. DAVIES, *The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom* (New York 1983) 153.

community, in that the disciples (including the Thomas members) cannot be accepted by God on the basis of outward obedience, unless their internal attitude is right<sup>(45)</sup>. The view of the bridegroom leaving “ΤΗΝΥΜΦΩΝ (the bridal chamber)”<sup>(46)</sup> in which the meaningful practices of fasting and praying are advised, confirms that the faithful fasting and prayer are still effective and useful in the community of Thomas.

Keeping the “ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ (Sabbath)”<sup>(47)</sup>, seems to have a positive perspective in the policy, if one reads the *Logion* 27b as demanding the celebration of the Jewish Sabbath in recollecting the traditional custom. But since the Sabbath observation is related to the apodosis clause of “seeing ΠΑΤΕΡ (the Father)”, the futuristic saying of the Sabbath should be understood as either “the seventh day” or “the entire period of seven days”<sup>(48)</sup>. Further, if the previous part, “If you do not fast as regards the world” means a continuity, the Sabbath rule should be treated as “all week long”. In this case it is plausible to accept that “σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον/ ΕΙΡΕ Μ•Τ•ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ Ν•ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ (sabbatising the Sabbath)” “symbolises abstinence from the formal world and from the worldly values”<sup>(49)</sup>. Baarda, a gnostic reader of Thomas, who assumed the Demiurge and the world as Sabbath<sup>(50)</sup>,

<sup>(45)</sup> The reverse concept of “If you do not fast as regards the world, you will not find the kingdom”, means that if you indeed fast for what the world needs, the practitioner will find the kingdom or will experience what he/she was fasting for. Attridge’s Greek word of ‘fasting as regards the world’, according to Valantasis, can be reinterpreted as ‘fasting with respect to the world’. VALANTASIS, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 40-41. MARIJANEN, “Thomas and Jewish Religious Practices”, 169.

<sup>(46)</sup> “But when the bridegroom leaves the bridal chamber, then let them fast and pray” (*Logion* 104b). Marjanen interprets ‘ΤΗΝΥΜΦΩΝ (the bridal chamber)’ as ‘the state a Thomasine Christian attains after having been chosen for salvation’. Ibid., 172.

<sup>(47)</sup> “If you keep not the Sabbath as Sabbath, you will not see the Father” (*Logion* 27b).

<sup>(48)</sup> Brown’s one page article is quite clear on the meaning of the Thomasine Sabbath. P. BROWN, “The Sabbath and the Week in Thomas 27” *NT* 34 (1992) 193.

<sup>(49)</sup> Ptolemy’s *Letter to Flora* has a similar vein: “to keep the Sabbath (means) that we desist from evil works” (Epiphanius, *Panarian* 33.5.12), quoted from MARIJANEN, “Thomas and Jewish Religious Practices”, 177-178.

<sup>(50)</sup> See details at T. BAARDA, “‘If You not Sabbatize the Sabbath ...’ The Sabbath as God or World in Gnostic Understanding (EV. THOM., LOG. 27)”, *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World* (ed. R. VAN DEN BROEK – T. BAARDA – J. MANSFELD (Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1988) 180-192.

denies this term of “σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον/ ΕΙΠΕ Μ•Τ•CΑΜΒΑΤΟΝ Ν•CΑΒ•ΒΑΤΟΝ (sabbatising the Sabbath)”, contending that it is neither “a Jewish-Christian device, nor an ascetical or encratitic directive”, but “in a cosmological sense as the denial of creation and/ or its Creator”<sup>(51)</sup>. The Thomas concept of the Sabbath does not, however, propose any ritual content or gnostic hint, but the meaning of the Sabbath is quoted in an emblematic way, in that the Jewish newcomer into the Thomasine community should be away “from sin, ... from the slavery of evil, from bad, unclean or shameless thoughts” all the times<sup>(52)</sup>.

The tradition of “Τ•CΒΒΕ (circumcision)” is also applied in the framework of the anti-Jewish rules: “If it (circumcision) were beneficial, their (Jewish) father would beget them already circumcised from their (Jewish) mother”<sup>(53)</sup>. The usefulness of “Τ•CΒΒΕ (circumcision)” is denied, because the intention of Jesus’ disciples focused on the formal purity of the Jewish ritual. This negative attitude towards the Jewish religious obligation signifies the meaninglessness of the bodily circumcision, when someone stays in the Thomasine community. Nevertheless, the Logiographer of the text allows the spiritual circumcision in “Τ•ΠΝΑ ΕΤ•ΟΥΛΛΒ (the Holy Spirit)”: “Rather, the true circumcision in Spirit has become completely profitable” (*Logion* 53). This kind of approach, in that the leader of Thomas had an anti-Jewish attitude, but still acknowledged the spiritual meaning of the traditional rituals, is suggested by Marjanen, who says that “the circumcision of heart brought by the Spirit is considered the prerequisite for hearing the Word, awakening faith, faithful service of God and putting off the body of flesh”<sup>(54)</sup>. Although “the true circumcision in Spirit” is not expressed anywhere except in *Logion* 53, the leader of Thomas clearly makes a distinction between the physical circumcision and “the true circumcision in Spirit”. This policy indirectly denotes that the major members of Thomas had come from Judaism, but the basic principle of “Τ•CΒΒΕ (circumcision)” was creatively reinterpreted in the early Christian community.

It is not unusual that the value of purity is treated seriously, while a dietary regulation of “ΠΕΤ•ΟΥ•ΝΑ•ΚΑΑ•Ϟ ΖΑΡΩ•ΤΝ ΟΥΟΜ•Ϟ (eat what they

<sup>(51)</sup> Ibid., 178-201.

<sup>(52)</sup> Ibid., 200.

<sup>(53)</sup> *Logion* 53.

<sup>(54)</sup> See MARJANEN, “Thomas and Jewish Religious Practices”, 179.

will set before you)", come to light<sup>(55)</sup>. The significance of inner purity in the NHC II, 2. 35: 24-35: 27<sup>(56)</sup>, is taken in the context of defiling a person who is not specifically identified. The *Logion* of Jesus, in relation to communicating with other people, warns the careful use of the "ταππο (mouth)"<sup>(57)</sup>. In other words, the text explains that food does not defile the consumer, but the thoughts of people need to be controlled before spitting them out. The mutual attitude of a "human relationship skill" is depicted in the judgmental saying of this Jewish formalism: "Do not be concerned from morning until evening ... about what you will wear"<sup>(58)</sup>. The Nag Hammadi text only mentions materialism in that clothes are for an outlook only, but the P. Oxy. 655. 1-17 details the agony of a person's heart with the additional issue of "τροφή (food)": "neither [about] your [food] and what [you will] eat, [nor] about [your clothing] and what you [will] wear"<sup>(59)</sup>. Here, the oxyrhynchus word of encouragement reflects that the members of the community (or the readers of the text) should realise the issue of the material world is not solved by one's outlook or the quality of food, but by the *sophia* of the Provider: "When you have no garment ... Who might add to your stature? He it is who will give you your cloak"<sup>(60)</sup>.

The internal purity policy of Thomas is seen in another scenario of Jesus, in which the formal attitude of washing the outside of the cup is criticised as unnecessary behaviour: "why do you wash the outside of the cup?"<sup>(61)</sup>. The second negative question of Jesus in the same saying is narrated as that the outside of the cup cannot be different from the inside, since "the cup-Maker" is the same person as the

<sup>(55)</sup> After the anti-saying of fasting, prayer, and almsgiving. *Logion* 14,4-5.

<sup>(56)</sup> "For what goes into your mouth will not defile you, but that which issues from your mouth — it is that which will defile you".

<sup>(57)</sup> Thomas followed Matthew twice in using the specific word 'ταππο (mouth): this is quoted by McArthur in terms of the dependence of Thomas on the Synoptic Gospels. But his view is quite irrelevant, rather, it is clearer that Thomas is close to Q, since many scriptures of Matthew are part of Q. H.K. MCARTHUR, "The Dependence of the Gospel of Thomas on the Synoptics", *ET* 71 (1960) 286-287.

<sup>(58)</sup> NHC II, 2. 39,24-27.

<sup>(59)</sup> One could assume that the redactor of the Coptic text omitted some of the Greek phrase of Thomas whether this was done deliberately or not. For a brief authenticity of Thomas, see R.MC L. WILSON, "The Coptic 'Gospel of Thomas'", *NTS* 5 (1959) 273-276.

<sup>(60)</sup> P. Oxy. 655. 13-17.

<sup>(61)</sup> *Logion* 89.

Creator of all. While the meaning of “ΤΕΤΝ•ΕΙΩΕ (you (pl.) wash)” is, for Baker<sup>(62)</sup>, presumed to be equivalent to the Syriac version of the *Diatessaron* and *Pseudo-Macarius*, Uro infers that the Nag Hammadi version of Thomas (NHC II, 2: 48: 04-07) is closer to the Lukan version (11,40) than the Matthean version (23,36)<sup>(63)</sup>. These hypothetical presuppositions, however, lose their credibility, when one regards the analogy between Q and Thomas that the passages of Q 11,39b.41 describe the same issue of purity as in Thomas<sup>(64)</sup>. The Q *Logion* clarifies Pharisees (traditional Jewish leaders) to whom the warning of Jesus was spoken. Although the story of “washing the cup” indicates no solution for the identity of the cup, the *Logion* of “ΤΡ•ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ (the cup)” implies that true purity is not something that one wants to show externally, but is something they realise about the cup-Maker: “Do you not realise that he who made the inside is the same one who made the outside?”<sup>(65)</sup>. The attitude of Thomas towards purity highlights the internalisation of the Christian faith, as opposed to the actuality of the traditional Jews.

Such anti-Jewish rules, for the characteristics of Thomas, can be classified as “semi-ascetical” in the context of the new proselytisers leaving their Jewish families and moderating their traditional behaviours<sup>(66)</sup>. Whether they come from a positive or negative motive, the major traditions of fasting, prayer, almsgiving, Sabbath, circumcision, diet and purity are all functional materials by which anyone can reasonably determine the ascetical figure as the identity of the Thomasine community. Frend, Meyer and Buckley, who identified

<sup>(62)</sup> See D.A. BAKER, “Pseudo-Macarius and the Gospel of Thomas”, *VC* 18 (1964) 217-225. ID., “The Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron”, *JTS* 16 (1965) 449-454.

<sup>(63)</sup> While Uro handles the Matthean and Lukan texts, he does not allow the involvement of Q. Uro still believes that the origin of the Thomasine tradition was definitely involved by ‘some form of Jewish-Christianity’. R. URO, “Washing the Outside of the Cup”, *From Quest to Q*, 303-322.

<sup>(64)</sup> Many Jesus sayings of Thomas are in Q. This is one of them: “Woe to you, Pharisees, for you purify the outside of the cup and dish, but inside they are full of plunder and dissipation. Purify ... the inside of the cup, ... its outside ... pure” (Q 11,39b.41). ROBINSON, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 18.

<sup>(65)</sup> *Logion* 89.

<sup>(66)</sup> Valantasis recognises Thomas in the same period of John and Ignatius (100-110 C.E.), because of the ascetic sight. The new theory of Valantasis, however, is unacceptable in this paper. R. VALANTASIS, “Is the Gospel of Thomas Ascetical?: Revisiting An Old Problem With A New Theory”, *J ECS* 7 (1999) 55-81. ID., *The Gospel of Thomas* (London – New York 1997) 21-24.

the asceticism of Thomas based on “the presence (or absence) of ascetical themes”, found that the text declares “an advance toward spiritual perfection through the practice of ascetic virtues and repentance”<sup>(67)</sup>. Richardson and Quispel, who thought of Thomas as having an unclear attribute of a fully developed second-century gnosticism, surmise Thomas to be either the Gospel manifesting “a strict encratite predilection for celibacy and the rejection of marriage” in a Syrian tradition, or the encratite Thomas “moving toward gnosticism”<sup>(68)</sup>. Furthermore, Desjardins postulates that Thomas was formulated in North-East Syria (probably thinking of Edessa), because the text reveals the interests of Syriac asceticism<sup>(69)</sup>. The figure of Thomas within the early Syrian asceticism is constructed in the period of the third- or fourth-century C.E., during which the early Christian movement was eventually extended into the regions inhabited by a Syriac majority<sup>(70)</sup>. If Thomas is dated as late second-century C.E., then it is probable that the text was affected by the (early) second-century encratic or gnostic origins. However, since Thomas and Q are so similar as Jewish-Christian texts from the middle of the first century C.E. (45-60 C.E.), to expect any involvement from those pagan movements is extremely unrealistic. In contrast, the extensive usage of the Jewish regulations within the Jesus *Logia* was the crucial medium

(67) Such as childlikeness, singleness, abstinence, world-renunciation, wealth-renunciation, family-renunciation, sexuality-renunciation, prohibition of procreation and marriage, continuous prayer, and fasting. See W.H.C. FREND, “The Gospel of Thomas: Is Rehabilitation Possible?”, *JTS* 18 (1967) 13-26. J. JACOBSEN BUCKLEY, “An Interpretation of Logion 114 in the Gospel of Thomas”, *NT* 27 (1985) 270-273. M.W. MEYER, “Making Mary Male: The Categories ‘Male’ and ‘Female’ in the Gospel of Thomas”, *NTS* 31 (1985) 554-556.

(68) See C. RICHARDSON, “The Gospel of Thomas: Gnostic or Encratite?”, *The Heritage of the Early Church. Essays in Honor of Georges Florousky* (eds. D. NEIMAN – M. SLATKIN) (Rome 1973) 71. B. GÜRTNER, *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas* (London 1961) 12. H. KOESTER, *Ancient Christian Gospels. Their History and Development* (London 1990) 75-128. O. CULLMANN, “The Gospel of Thomas and the Problem of the Age of the Tradition Contained Therein”, *Int* 16 (1962) 418-438. R. CAMERON, “The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Origins”, *The Future of Early Christianity. Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (ed. B.A. PEARSON) (Minneapolis 1991) 381-392.

(69) M. DESJARDINS, “Where was the Gospel of Thomas Written?”, *TJT* 8 (1992) 126. See also VALANTASIS, “Is the Gospel of Thomas Ascetical?”, 59-60.

(70) The monastic life of Syrian and Egyptian in the fourth and fifth centuries C.E. originated from the ascetic Christians of the early church. S.P. BROCK, “Greek and Syriac in Latin Antique Syria”, *Literary and Power in the Ancient World* (eds. A.K. BOWMAN – G. WOOLF) (Cambridge 1994) 149-160.

in the spiritual atmosphere of the Thomasine community, when the new proselytisers tried to settle down in the Christian community. The *Logia* of Thomas should be comprehensive in the perspective of “the community orientation guide” through which the new proselytisers from Judaism renounced their old Jewish mentality and adopted the charismatic customs of Thomas. The transitional process of their new identity is additionally elucidated by Valantasis, in that “for the task of refashioning one-self, the gradual and sustained performances incrementally construct a new identity, slowly building up a new way of understanding self, society, and world”<sup>(71)</sup>.

### 3. The Thomasine Beatitudes

The community rules, thirdly, are seen in the phrases of “μακαριος (Blessed)”, although Stroker’s *Extra-Canonical Sayings of Jesus* does not include any beatitudes of Jesus as part of the rules of the early Christian communities<sup>(72)</sup>. The Thomas Logiographer quoted the term μακαριος about thirteen times<sup>(73)</sup> in ten different *Logia*<sup>(74)</sup> with six μακαριοι used for different purposes<sup>(75)</sup>. The μακαριος *Logia* 7, 18, 19, 49, 58 and 103 begin grammatically with the plural article of ζεν. The single article of ορ is also used in *Logia* of 54, 68 and 69<sup>(76)</sup>. The μακαριος of the *Logion* 79, expressed as νεειατ, is mystically exceptional, but the subjective noun still expresses the same meaning as μακαριος<sup>(77)</sup>. The μακαριος *Logia* are formed in an apophthegmatic way in order to keep the mind of the community members steadfast in their new belief. The Matthean text contains nine μακαριος sayings in a professional structure for its own community readers<sup>(78)</sup>, while the

<sup>(71)</sup> Although the new community concept of Valantasis is still based on the ascetic view of 100-110 C.E. his imagining of the new proselytisers is quite plausible. VALANTASIS, “Is the Gospel of Thomas Ascetical?”, 75-81.

<sup>(72)</sup> Stroker collected a lot of non-canonical *Logia* of Jesus including Thomas and enumerated them with other relevant texts. See W.D. STROKER, *Extracanonial Sayings of Jesus* (Atlanta, GA 1989) 198-245.

<sup>(73)</sup> NHC II, 2: 33: 24; 36: 14, 17; 41: 27; 42: 23; 43: 08; 45: 21, 25, 28; 47: 04, 06-07, 10 and 50: 06.

<sup>(74)</sup> *Logia* 7, 18, 19, 49, 54, 58, 68, 69, 79 and 103.

<sup>(75)</sup> *Logia* 7, 18, 19, 79a, 79c and 103.

<sup>(76)</sup> This μακαριος articles are decided according to the following objects. They are not relevant to the interpretation of the μακαριος *Logia* of Thomas.

<sup>(77)</sup> The editor of the Nag Hammadi Thomas used a different term for “blessed”, which is not clearly identified yet.

<sup>(78)</sup> Matt 5,3-11.



four μακαριοι sayings of the Lukan Gospel are described in connection with the four ουροι (woe) sayings<sup>(79)</sup>. The phenomenon of the μακαριοι sayings is not exceptional in the Q tradition of Jesus. The scholarly reconstructed text (called “the Synoptic Sayings Gospel”) accommodates four μακαριοι sayings, mainly in Q 6,20-23. Such popularity of the μακαριοι sayings does not naturally lead to measuring the authenticity or reliability of Thomas by counting the numbers of the μακαριοι. Nevertheless, one is still able to confirm that the eight *Logia* of the thirteen μακαριοι in Thomas certainly manifest a kind of encouragement and exhortation used for the new proselytisers or those who were already in the community<sup>(80)</sup>.

The *Logion* of “Blessed are the solitary and elect”<sup>(81)</sup>, allegorises a scene of separation from Judaism. This beatitude of Thomas is not revealed in any part of the Canonical Gospels. However, the view of “ετ•οττη” (“elect” or “chosen”)<sup>(82)</sup>, according to Layton, supports the spiritual celibacy situation from their previous religious life<sup>(82)</sup>. The motivational *Logion* of Jesus: “I shall choose you, one out of a thousand, and two out of ten thousand”<sup>(83)</sup>, discloses the destiny of the chosen people. Even if it is not directly connected, Klauck insists on the formational process of new Christian communities on the basis of

<sup>(79)</sup> Luke 6,20-26.

<sup>(80)</sup> The μακαριοι *Logia* 7, 18, and 19 are belonged to the traditional wisdom sayings. The two μακαριοι *Logia* of NHC II, 2: 47: 04 and 10 are already mentioned in the family rules of Thomas. This part will selectively treat the μακαριοι *Logia* 49, 54, 58, 68, 69 (NHC II, 2: 45: 25, 28), 79 (NHC II, 2: 47: 07) and 103.

<sup>(81)</sup> *Logion* 49. When a Jew leaves the traditional religion, s/he become “Ν•ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ (the solitary)” from them but in the same time he/she is “ετ•οττη” (elect or chosen). While Lambdin interprets ετ•οττη as “elect”, Meyer’s explanation is applicable in this paper. See M. MEYER, *The Gospel of Thomas. The Hidden Sayings of Jesus* (New York 2002).

<sup>(82)</sup> “But it is the solitary who will enter the bridal chamber” (*Logion* 75). The words ετ•οττη are also interpreted as “superior”. B. LAYTON, *The Coptic Gnostic Library; Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7 (with XII,2, BRIT. LIB. OR. 4926(1), and P.OXY. 1, 654, 655)*. Volume One: Gospel According to Thomas, Gospel According to Philip Hypostasis of the Archons, and Indexes (Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1989). Morrice, who has an independent concept for Thomas, does not seem to relate the physical celibacy practice, but rather an insight into the internal celibacy of Thomas members. G.W. MORRICE, *Hidden Sayings of Jesus. Words Attributed to Jesus Outside the Four Gospels* (London 1997) 84-89.

<sup>(83)</sup> *Logion* 23.

“they shall stand as a single one (*Logion* 23b)”<sup>(84)</sup>. The saying “Blessed is the man who has suffered”<sup>(85)</sup> shows that the religio-political separation was not only a distressing experience in the era of the ideological conflict, but also brought internal and external sufferings, caused by the conservative remainders of Judaism. The process of the painful deliverance proves the socio-religious persecution motivated by (Jewish) fellows or family members: “when you are hated and persecuted”<sup>(86)</sup>. The Q 6,22, “blessed are you when they insult and persecute”, is reminiscent of the sayings in *Logia* 58b and 68<sup>(87)</sup>. Koester, through *Logion* 68, asserts the authenticity of the persecution saying, because the “persecution has disappeared in the Lukan redaction of this saying, but is preserved in Mt. 5:11”<sup>(88)</sup>. Such a view of oppression came from the traditional Jews and their confidence in their future. *Logion* 69 clearly manifests the internal anxiety and agonising about the decision of conversion from the old religion to the new religion<sup>(89)</sup>, because the religious change was not an easy decision or temporary shift, but was a life-changing commitment through personal agony: “those who have been persecuted in their heart”<sup>(90)</sup>. Regarding the connection of *Logion* 69a to the previous *Logion* 68, Funk contends that the beatitude formulation of Thomas’ persecution “has been influenced by the persecution of the members of the Christian community”<sup>(91)</sup>.

<sup>(84)</sup> By the statement: “These solitary individuals formed small groups which led their own lives within large groupings of communities”, Klauck does not specify one particular Christian group, but it is certain that his concept includes the Thomas group as well, since the Thomasine community was also an early Christian community, not a second- or third-century Gentile group reproduced somewhere in Syria. KLAUCK, *The Religious Context of Early Christianity*, 112.

<sup>(85)</sup> *Logion* 58a.

<sup>(86)</sup> *Logion* 68.

<sup>(87)</sup> H.W. ATTRIDGE, “Reflections on Research into Q”, *Semeia* 55 (1992) 223-234.

<sup>(88)</sup> “Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you” (Matt 5,11). KOESTER, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 89.

<sup>(89)</sup> Even though the saying contains some elements of Matthew 5,6.8.10.

<sup>(90)</sup> The Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* in general is quoted as per Thomas G. Lambdin’s translation, but this part is from the first English translation of A. Guillaumont and others in 1959. T.O. LAMBDIN, “The Gospel of Thomas (II, 2)”, *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (ed. J.M. ROBINSON) (Leiden – New York – Köln 1996) 124-138. *The Gospel According to Thomas*. Coptic Text Established and Translated (eds. A. GUILLAUMONT – H.-CH. PUECH, ET AL.) (Leiden – London 1959).

<sup>(91)</sup> This phrase is also in Q 6,21a. Cf. *The Five Gospels*. The Search for the

The Logiographer of Thomas also reminds modern readers that the situation of being separated is like the person who is hungry, but the phrase of “the belly of him who desire will be filled”, in a metaphorical way, predicts that the loneliness and emptiness of the hungry man/woman will be filled by the spiritual brotherhood (or sisterhood) in the community<sup>(92)</sup>. The word of Q 6,21 speaks about the blessing of those who hunger: “Blessed are you (who) hunger, for you will eat your fill”<sup>(93)</sup>. Instead of “the hungry person”, the solitary situation of the new proselytisers is also described in the terms of “*πνζΗΚΕ* (the poor)” in that the person desisted from his/her previous religious heritage (*Logion* 54)<sup>(94)</sup>. The blessing of the poor parallels with Q 6,20: “Blessed are you poor, for God’s reign is for you”<sup>(95)</sup>. This destitution refers to material poverty, but the connotation of internal penury should not be disregarded in these Thomasine beatitudes. Wilson carefully asserts the textual value of the *Logion*, in that “Thomas preserves the original form, which Luke has altered by substituting “God”<sup>(96)</sup> and Matthew interpreted by adding “in spirit” after “the poor”<sup>(97)</sup>. Morrice maintains the *Logion* 54 in connection with the “oral tradition independently of the Synoptic Gospels”<sup>(98)</sup>. Further, the saying, “Blessed are those who have heard the word of the father and have truly kept it”<sup>(99)</sup>, gives a certain direction that the community readers of Thomas can follow. The leader of the community instructs that the reading practice of “*τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ πατρὸς* (the word of the Father)” is a significant way to become internally rich, through finding the eternal “*ὦνζ* (life)”<sup>(100)</sup>. This *μακάριος Logion* is

---

Authentic Words of Jesus. New Translation and Commentary (eds. R.W. FUNK – R.W. HOOVER ET ALII) (New York 1993) 512. See also G. LÜDEMANN, *Jesus after 2000 years. What He really said and did* (London 2000) 625.

<sup>(92)</sup> *Logion* 69b.

<sup>(93)</sup> ROBINSON, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 5. J.S. KLOPPENBORG, *The Formation of Q. Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia 1987) 171-173. H.W. ATTRIDGE, “Reflections on Research into Q”, *Semeia* 55 (1992) 223-234.

<sup>(94)</sup> “Jesus said: Blessed are the poor, for yours is the Kingdom of Heaven”.

<sup>(95)</sup> B. CHILTON, “The Gospel According to Thomas As a Source of Jesus’ Teachings”, *Gospel Perspectives. The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels* (ed. D. WENHAM) (Sheffield 1985) V, 155-157.

<sup>(96)</sup> Luke 6,20.

<sup>(97)</sup> Matt 5,3. WILSON, *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, 55. D.J. HARRINGTON, *The Gospel of Thomas* (Sacra Pagina 1; Collegeville, MN 1991) 76-85.

<sup>(98)</sup> MORRICE, *Hidden Sayings of Jesus*, 86-87.

<sup>(99)</sup> *Logion* 79b.

<sup>(100)</sup> *Logion* 58.

connected to the worth and priority of the community “σωφρονισμός (discipline)”.

#### 4. *The Socio-Ethical Rules*

Fourthly, when the Logiographer of the text became interested in the doctrinal disciplines, the socio-ethical issues were also focused on in terms of the community order. The Jesus of *Logion* 63 shared the personal thoughts of a rich man: “I will use my money that I may sow and reap and plant and fill my storehouses with fruit, so that I lack nothing”. The short narrative of the rich man, who had much money and who had a great business plan in mind, teaches the community readers that the secular material involves fulfilling a personal goal or satisfaction, but the conclusion of “that night he died” implies that money or riches cannot change the human destiny of “Τ•ΜΟΥ (death)” or something beyond “Τ•ΜΟΥ (death)”. The method of how one spends “ΖΟΜΤ (money)”, is pictured in the other saying of “do not lend it (money) at interest, but give [it] to one from whom you will not get it back”<sup>(101)</sup>. In the saying, the community policy of Thomas is described in a compassionate way, that no one should expect any extra income from what they give away. Rather, the material contribution should be merciful and graceful rather than repayable. These sayings minimise the importance of money for personal benefits, but encourage members of Thomas to keep the mentality of a charity. It is not a gnostic mentality of “indifferentism against the world”, but is like the spirit of the *Acts* Christians: “All the believers were one in heart and mind. No one claimed that any of his possessions was his own, but they shared everything they had” (Acts 4,32). The right attitude towards using money is continually illustrated in relation to the principle of tax payment: “Give Caesar what belongs to Caesar”. In *Logion* 100, Jesus spoke wisely to the crowds who had asked the social issue of taxes; this does not just show the social function of money, but, in addition, reveals the true ownership of money.

Meanwhile, several of the Thomasine *Logia* present the social attitude of “diligence” through which the leader of the community demonstrated a consistent structure for community activities including labour. The *Logion* 41 of Jesus: “Whoever has something in his hand will receive more, and whoever has nothing will be deprived of even the little he has”, does not clarify the meaning of “ϣ ρ̅Ν•ΤΕϣ̅ δ̅ΙΧ (something

<sup>(101)</sup> *Logion* 95.

in his hand)”, but the words carry a certainty that the diligent one will be accepted (by the community), while the lazy one will be even worse than before, as depriving “**ⲡⲕⲉ ⲱⲟⲙ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲁⲩ** (the little he has)”. The blessing of the diligent one is repeated in *Logion* 45: “a good man brings forth good from his storehouse (his good heart); an evil man brings forth evil things from his evil storehouse (his evil heart)”. The honesty of the good man’s story is associated positively to the concept of “diligence” which the leader of Thomas valued in the context of the social rules. The case of an evil man who causes social problems contrasts with the lazy man having nothing. Another parable of Jesus agrees with the principle that the diligence of a man parallels honesty: “He leased it (the vineyard) to tenant farmers so that they might work it and he might collect the produce from them”<sup>(102)</sup>. The vineyard owner in *Logion* 65, who had good intentions, is seen as the diligent and honest person, despite the tenant farmers having evil thoughts and plundering the owner’s possessions, as well as killing other innocent people, including the son of the owner.

The activity of making or keeping “**ⲉⲓⲡⲏⲛⲏ** (peace)” is also regarded as an effective social-ethical rule, according to the saying “If two make peace with each other in this one house”<sup>(103)</sup>. If the words “**ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲏⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲱⲧ** (in this one house)” are interpreted to refer to the Thomasine community, modern readers can easily understand that the purpose of this *Logion* was maintaining the community in peace. The potentiality of “**ⲉⲓⲡⲏⲛⲏ** (peace)” produces the power to move a mountain; this is reported in the *Logion* 106 in which the community policy of “**ⲉⲓⲡⲏⲛⲏ** (peace)” is reinterpreted as a unifying concept of the community: “When you make the two one”. The same concept of unity or harmony is quoted in *Logion* 22: “when you make the inside like the outside and the outside like the inside, and the above like the below”. The power of unity (like keeping peace) among the community members is expressed as “to move a mountain” in the NHC II, 2. 50.21-22<sup>(104)</sup>. Such phrases of Thomas show that the community leaders, through the social rules, expected the new proselytisers to abandon their Jewish attitude and cross the boundary into the Jesus community. The following *Logion* of Jesus indirectly expresses the internal and external trouble experienced by a person undergoing the process:

<sup>(102)</sup> *Logion* 65.

<sup>(103)</sup> *Logion* 48.

<sup>(104)</sup> “When you say, ‘mountain, move away’, it will move away”.

It is impossible for a man to mount two horses or to stretch two bows. And it is impossible for a servant to serve two masters; otherwise he will honour the one and treat the other contemptuously. No man drinks old wine and immediately desires to drink new wine. And new wine is not put into old wineskins, lest they burst; nor is old wine put into a new wineskin, lest it spoil it. An old patch is not sewn into a new garment, because a tear would result<sup>(105)</sup>.

The man mounting two horses or stretching two bows is comparable with the servant serving two masters. This *Logion* of Jesus, according to Quispel, is proven as not being dependent on Q. Further, the literary uniqueness of the *Logion* 47 is argued by Koester, in that “the version ... completely stays within the limits of natural expansion of a popular proverb”<sup>(106)</sup>. So “this proverb would have had before it was incorporated into Q”<sup>(107)</sup>, supports Thomas’ independence from the Synoptic Gospels<sup>(108)</sup>. The thoughts of the wine drinker and new wine are also connected with the proverb of an old patch. In this regard, the motivation of change, for life in the new society<sup>(109)</sup>, is in accordance with the social-ethical rules of the Thomasine movement, even though Grant and Freedman assume that Thomas, in the sense that “an old patch is not sewn into a new garment”, applied the new patch and the old garment story from the Synoptic texts<sup>(110)</sup>. Such a demonstration of implausibility can be grafted onto the case of the new proselytisers, who were confused between the new religious life and old religious life<sup>(111)</sup>.

As a result, the various legal sources, declaring the community rules, legitimise the existence and religio-political strategy of the

<sup>(105)</sup> *Logion* 47.

<sup>(106)</sup> Since the text does not show any sign of the unnecessary duplication ‘hate the one and love the other’ or of the secondary application of the proverb (‘serving God and mammon’). KOESTER, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 90.

<sup>(107)</sup> Ibid.

<sup>(108)</sup> This paper contends that Thomas and Q are independent of the Canonical Gospels. Q and Thomas are also individuals, even though they have many common points.

<sup>(109)</sup> R.M. GRANT – D.N. FREEDMAN, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*. According to the Gospel of Thomas (London – Glasgow 1960) 159.

<sup>(110)</sup> Luke 5,36, Matt 9,16 and Mark 2,21.

<sup>(111)</sup> However, the discernment of a wise fisherman, picking up the only ‘fine large fish’ without difficulty, can conclusively remind the Thomas readers that when an outsider became an insider of the community. “... The man is like a wise fisherman who cast his net into the sea and drew it up from the sea full of small fish. Among them the wise fisherman found a fine large fish. He threw all the small fish back into the sea and chose the large fish without difficulty” (*Logion* 8).

Thomasine movement in the history of early Christianity. Many of the anti-Jewish traditions and customs were rejected by the Jesus of Thomas; this means not only the undeniable population of Jews in the community, but also that the community policy was not really parallel with Judaism, but had its own unique formula. The positive laws on family testify that the Thomas people were not somatic celibates, but that they desired the sacred family as spiritual celibates who had left their mother's religion. The anti-family rules in this respect were for those who were newly converted to the Jewish-Christian community. The negative perspective of family<sup>(112)</sup> was a psychological barrier the new converters faced at the beginning. The unfriendly thoughts of Thomas against the religious leaders continuously recount that the community leader did not compromise with those religious formalists. Such an anti-Jewish attitude is revealed through the view that the Jewish customary practices of "Ε...ΝΗCΤΕΥΕ (fasting)", "Ε...ΨΑΛΗΑ (praying)", "Ε...ΕΛΕΗΜΟCΥΝΗ (almsgiving)", "keeping the "CΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ (Sabbath)" and "Τ•CΒΒΕ (circumcision)" were reinterpreted according to the intention and purpose of the Logiographer of Thomas. The Jesus of Thomas did not criticise the rituals itself, but, rather, disagreed with the formal attitudes of the practitioners. The word of advice, "ΨΩΠΕ ΕΤΕΤΝ•Ρ•ΠΑΡΑΓΕ (Become passers-by)"<sup>(113)</sup> is applicable in this context; one no longer wishes to be part of the original Jewish group, so gives up his/ her previous identity and becomes a new insider of the Thomasine-Jesus movement in early Christianity. The socio-ethical rules on managing money, diligent behaviours and desire for peace and unity in the community life, generalises Thomas not as gnostic, but as the socio-ethical Christian group in a semi-ascetic context. The μακαριος *Logia* of suffering, being hated, persecuted, poor and hungry, illustrate the ways to be blessed, when the new proselytisers overcame their internal and external circumstances. These community rules of Thomas that do not hold the dualism of "spirit and soul" or "soul and body", but keeping the independent faith of a "Trinity"<sup>(114)</sup>, ultimately

<sup>(112)</sup> *Logia* 16, 55, 79, 86b, 99a, 101 and 105.

<sup>(113)</sup> *Logion* 42.

<sup>(114)</sup> The triangle-relationship of the Trinity is particularly reflected in the saying of "where there are three Gods, ... where there are Two or One, I (Jesus) am with Him" (*Logion* 30). The following *Logia* tradition also supports the individual roles of the Trinity: 1) The *Logia* regarding to *the Father* (Τ•ΕΙΩΤ) are 27b, 40, 50, 69b, 79b, 83, 99d, 100 (God) and 113.2) The *Logia* regarding to *the Son* (Τ•ΩΗΡΕ) are 44, 86 and 100.3) The *Logia* regarding to *the Holy Spirit* (Τ•ΠΝΑ ΕΤ•ΟΥΑΔΒ) are 44 and 53c.



sustain the notion that the *Gospel of Thomas*, though, cannot be approved as a new Canonical Gospel, but was a lost Q of Qs that existed in the middle of the first century C.E.

Department of Studies in Religion  
University of Sydney  
NSW, 2006, Australia

D.W. KIM

#### SUMMARY

This article argues for the diversity of early Christianity in terms of religio-cultural communities. Each early Christian group, based on a personal revelation of leadership and the group's socio-political milieu, maintained its own tradition (oral, written, or both) of Jesus for the continuity and prosperity of the movement. The leaders of early Christianity allowed outsiders to become insiders in the condition where the new comers committed to give up their previous religious attitude and custom and then follow the new community rules. The membership of the Thomasine group is not exceptional in this case. The *Logia* tradition of P. Oxy. 1, 654.655, and NHC II, 2. 32: 10-51: 28 in the context of community policy will prove the pre-gnostic peculiarity of the creative and independent movement within the Graeco-Roman world.

## **James 4,1-4 in the Light of the Jewish Two Ways Tradition 3,1-6**

The close resemblances between the different versions of the Two Ways (including Did 1–6, Barn 18–20 and the *Doctrina Apostolorum*)<sup>(1)</sup> are generally explained in modern research by their — direct or indirect — dependence upon an earlier Jewish Two Ways document which is no longer known to us. The late David Flusser and I recently attempted to reconstruct this original teaching. Because this source was in Greek, the document may also be called the Greek Two Ways<sup>(2)</sup>. For our purpose, it is important to establish that this (hypothetical) version generally reflects the precise wording of the Two Ways in the *Didache*, except for the Christianised sections, 1,3b–2,1 and 6,2–3<sup>(3)</sup>. In this paper, therefore, the Christian *Didache* will be followed excluding those parts and details differing from the hypothesized Greek Two Ways.

In the first century of our era, the doctrine of the Two Ways was employed within Christian circles in pre-baptismal instruction<sup>(4)</sup>. This is explicitly stated in Did 7,1 in a verse that follows right after the rendering of the Two Ways section: “Concerning baptism, baptize as follows: after having previously said these things (ταῦτα πάντα

<sup>(1)</sup> There are also later recensions of the Two Ways tradition which include church orders, letters, and monastic writings. These recensions are represented by the *Apostolic Church Order*, the *Epitome of the Canons of the Holy Apostles*, the *Life of Shenoute*, the Ps. Athanasian *Syntagma Doctrinae*, and the *Fides CCCXVIII Patrum*.

<sup>(2)</sup> For the above information and a reconstruction of the Greek Two Ways (GTW), see H. VAN DE SANDT – D. FLUSSER, *The Didache. Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (CRI III/5; Assen – Minneapolis 2002) 112–139.

<sup>(3)</sup> In the *Letter of Barnabas* and the *Doctrina Apostolorum* there are no passages that parallel the materials in Did 1,3a–2,1 and Did 6,2–3. For further details on the establishment of an earlier form of the Two Ways and its versions in early Christian literature, see VAN DE SANDT – FLUSSER, *The Didache*, 55–80; 238–270.

<sup>(4)</sup> By this I do not mean, however, that the use of the Two Ways teaching was solely restricted to catechetical instruction prior to baptism. That it was used otherwise as well is shown by its insertion into the Letter of Barnabas, which was written to baptized Christians.

προειπόντες), baptize” (7,1)<sup>(5)</sup>. It makes good sense to assume a baptismal setting influenced James, too, and that some form of Did 1–6 underlies the *Letter of James* to a certain extent. First, Jas 1,21 (stressing the renunciation of all evil) is strikingly similar to 1 Pet 2,1. Since the latter verse belongs to a passage (1,23–2,2) reflecting a baptismal context, a baptismal setting is not unlikely for Jas 1,21 either<sup>(6)</sup>. Also the statement in Jas 1,18 — about the “word of truth” bringing about a rebirth of God’s creatures — might indicate a similar (baptismal) life-situation (*Sitz im Leben*) as in 1 Pet 1,23<sup>(7)</sup>. The teaching might have been part of the catechesis for any candidate prior to his or her baptism in James’ community.

The Two Ways may also be the background to the *Letter of James* for another reason. The letter shows a dualistic shape in its teaching and theology. James builds his letter around the polar opposition of two lifestyles, one led in friendship with God, the other in friendship with the world, and this antagonism can be taken as thematic for the composition of James’ letter as a whole (Jas 4,4)<sup>(8)</sup>. Similar antagonistic wording and clarification is found in the Two Ways.

<sup>(5)</sup> As late as in fourth-century Egypt, the Two Ways manual was used as a pre-baptismal teaching and a basic instruction about Christian life to neophytes. See VAN DE SANDT – FLUSSER, *The Didache*, 86-89.

<sup>(6)</sup> F. MUSSNER, *Der Jakobusbrief* (HTKNT XIII/1; Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1987) 101; See also W. POPKES, *Adressaten, Situation und Form des Jakobusbriefes* (SBS 125/126; Stuttgart 1986) 176-178; P.H. DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK 1982) 90. For example, the Greek verb ἀποτίθημι (“put aside”) in Jas 1,21 (cf. 1 Pet 2,1) might reflect a baptismal setting. It can be used literally for taking off clothes and laying them aside. In the baptismal ritual clothes were taken off for ritual purification and rebirth into a new life. See also L.T. JOHNSON, *The Letter of James. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; New York 1995) 201; D.J. MOO, *The Epistle of James. An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK 1985) 80.

<sup>(7)</sup> See also Col 1,10; Eph 2,15; 4,21-24; 5,26. Compare K. SYREENI, “The Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways Teaching of the Didache”, *Matthew and The Didache. Two Documents from the same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (ed. H. VAN DE SANDT) (Assen – Minneapolis 2005) 91, n. 16.

<sup>(8)</sup> Cf. JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 288-289; ID., “Friendship with the World and Friendship with God: A Study of Discipleship in James”, *Discipleship in the New Testament* (ed. F. SEGOVIA) (Philadelphia 1985) 166-183; repr. in L.T. JOHNSON, *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God. Studies in the Letter of James* (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK 2004) 202-220; R. BAUCKHAM, *James. Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage* (New Testament Readings; London – New York 1999) 106; P.J. HARTIN, *James* (Sacra Pagina Series 14; Collegeville, MN 2003) 67-68; DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James*, 161.

In the following study I draw attention to some genuine puzzles in Jas 4,1-4. In order to demonstrate that James had connotations in mind related to vocabulary and ideas in the Two Ways, these obscurities will be clarified in the light of Did 3,1-6. Before continuing, however, one final point should be made with regard to the nature of the *Letter of James*. The writing does not seem to respond to the specific problems and needs of a particular community<sup>(9)</sup> although certain impressions with respect to those addressed do emerge. The simple and natural way in which James refers to Jewish law presumes that his readers are familiar with it and its relevance to them. At the same time, nothing is said about the Gentiles and the need to receive them into the community. Apparently the relationship of the Jesus movement to the Gentiles does not amount to a problem or issue for him. The letter appears to be communicating generally with Jewish-Christian congregations in the diaspora.

### 1. *Three Problems in Jas 4,1-4*

Jas 4,1-4 poses three particularly tantalizing problems. There is the initial problem as to why James refers to wars (πόλεμοι) and battles (μάχαι) in 4,1-2? Is he referencing political or national conflicts? One could consider these verses a warning against membership in a Zealotic revolutionary force meant to kill prominent Romans. Yet it is doubtful whether reference is made here to external conflicts because it does not match with James' suggestion that he is addressing problems within the community (ἐν ὑμῖν). Is he, then, referring to troubles disrupting intra-Christian fellowship? Is it an accusation directed toward concrete circumstances within a community? Such an interpretation fails to fit the preceding and following contexts. For would someone who is inclined to use physical force and outrageous violence be rebuked by James merely for neglecting prayers or praying wrongly<sup>(10)</sup>?

The harsh statement "you murder" is the second puzzling expression. It is even more difficult to understand than the concrete reference to wars and battles since it seems intolerably extreme when written to a congregation of Christians<sup>(11)</sup>. Is it a statement about a

<sup>(9)</sup> Cf. BAUCKHAM, *James*, 26-28.

<sup>(10)</sup> M. DIBELIUS, *James*. A Commentary on the Epistle of James (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1975) 218.

<sup>(11)</sup> Jas 5,6 probably is not a parallel to 4,1-3 as the verse condemns those who are clearly outside the community. Cf also MOO, *The Epistle of James*, 141.

verbal argument, private violence or national conflict? How can one seriously accuse Christian members of the community or the community as a whole of actual murder<sup>(12)</sup>? Moreover, “you murder” neither fits well with the following “you are envious” (ζηλοῦτε) which sounds slightly out of place after an accusation of an outrageous crime. Erasmus resolved the difficulty by offering a text-critical emendation. He proposed altering “you murder” (φονεύετε) to “you are jealous” (φθονεῖτε)<sup>(13)</sup>. This might seem an appropriate conjecture since the words φθόνος - ζήλος are often found paired in biblical and early-Christian literature (1 Macc 8,16; TestXII.Sim 2,7; 4,5; Gal 5,21; 1 Clem 3,2; 4,7.13; 5,2)<sup>(14)</sup>. On the other hand, appeals to textual emendation should always be a last option. There is no textual support whatsoever for this solution since all manuscripts attest to the present reading<sup>(15)</sup>.

The third difficulty regards the sudden address of the μοιχαλίδες (“adulteresses”) in 4,4. How can this diction be explained? The abrupt transition to the feminine vocative describes the community as being an adulterous generation. Indeed, there are many OT references where Israel is presented as God’s unfaithful wife denounced in prophetic books (Ezek 16,38; 23,45) but a marriage of God metaphor is found

<sup>(12)</sup> “Every attempt to make sense of ‘you kill’ (*phoneuete*) as it stands in the traditional text produces an intolerable climax...”; cf. J.B. ADAMSON, *The Epistle of James* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1976) 167.

<sup>(13)</sup> “Non video quid illud verbum *occiditis* ad sensum faciat. Forte scriptum fuit, φθονεῖτε et ζηλοῦτε, id est ‘Invidetis et aemulamini, et non potestis consequi’, ut scriptor dormitans pro φθονεῖτε scripserit φονεύετε; ...” (“I do not see how this word *you kill* makes sense here. Perhaps there was written φθονεῖτε and ζηλοῦτε, that is, ‘you are jealous and you seek, and you cannot obtain’, and so [I conclude that] a sleeping scribe wrote φονεύετε instead of φθονεῖτε; ...”); for text and translation, see J.L.H. KRANS, *Beyond What Is Written*. Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament (Diss.; Zutphen 2004) 112; for information about the conjecture’s reception history, see *ibid.*, 113 and n. 118.

<sup>(14)</sup> The terms φθόνος and ζήλος are often used interchangeably as well; cf. JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 271; DIBELIUS, *James*, 217-218; DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James*, 158, 163-164; MOO, *The Epistle of James*, 145; HARTIN, *James*, 192; and M.A. JACKSON-MCCABE, *Logos and Law in the Letter of James*. The Law of Nature, the Law of Moses, and the Law of Freedom (NTS 100; Leiden – Boston – Köln 2001) 203-204.

<sup>(15)</sup> Cf. DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James*, 158; HARTIN, *James*, 197. Various other explanations have been offered: G. KITTEL, “Der geschichtliche Ort des Jakobusbriefes”, ZNW 41 (1942) 71-105; esp. 87; P.J. HARTIN, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus* (JSNTSS 47; Sheffield 1991) 165, n. 2; S. LAWS, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (BNTC 18; London 1980) 171; JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 277.

nowhere else in James. Such symbolic language would differ from the imagery in the rest of the letter where it is precisely friendship and not marriage which is emphasized. James' readers can be friends with God like Abraham (2,23), or they can be friends with the world (4,4). How then to satisfactorily explain the selection of the adultery image in Jas 4,4<sup>(16)</sup>?

The present paper shows that these difficulties can be solved by invoking the aid of the Two Ways tradition, that is, the section as reflected in Did 3,1-6. This is not as simple a task as it may seem. It is true, James' letter is permeated with allusions to other sources such as the teaching of Jesus, the Bible, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and the *Wisdom of Solomon*. It is a redacted work, a text which was constructed from separate blocks of tradition which were then re-arranged to become integral parts of a coherent structure<sup>(17)</sup>. In most cases, however, there is no clear evidence to suggest the direct dependence of James on other writings since these parallels involve language or motifs that are found in more than one of these works. "Determining the precise provenance of any specific expression within James is commensurately difficult, since there are usually too many possibilities"<sup>(18)</sup>. Rather than consciously alluding to the sources he used, James re-expressed, reformulated, and developed these traditional materials as his own teaching<sup>(19)</sup>.

<sup>(16)</sup> For elaboration of these and other problems connected with the term 'adulteresses' in this verse, cf. J.J. SCHMITT, "You adulteresses! The Image in James 4:4", *NT* 28 (1986) 331-334.

<sup>(17)</sup> DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James*, 22-24; ID., "The Epistle of James in Modern Discussion", *ANRW* II.25,5 (Berlin – New York 1988) 3621-3645; esp. 3630; M.E. TAYLOR, "Recent Scholarship on the Structure of James", *Currents in Biblical Research* 3 (2004) 86-115; esp. 105-106.

<sup>(18)</sup> L.T. JOHNSON – W.H. WACHOB, "The Sayings of Jesus in the Letter of James", *Authenticating the Words of Jesus* (eds. B. CHILTON – C.A. EVANS) (NTTS 28/1; Leiden 1999) 431-450; repr. in JOHNSON, *Brother of Jesus*, 136-154; esp. 136.

<sup>(19)</sup> HARTIN, *James*, 82-85; DAVIDS, "The Epistle of James in Modern Discussion", 3630. See also BAUCKHAM, *James*, 78-83; W.H. WACHOB, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James* (SNTSMS 106; Cambridge 2000) 116. According to J.S. Kloppenborg ("The Reception of the Jesus Traditions in James", *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition* [ed. J. SCHLOSSER] [BETL 176; Leuven 2004] 93-141) "the lack of verbatim agreement between a predecessor text and its re-performance" is due to "the rhetorical practice of performance ... The differences between the predecessor text and the paraphrase are not due to the vagaries of oral transmission but due instead to deliberate and studied techniques of verbal and conceptual transformation" (221).

In order to reach our goal, we must now make a detour and take the following (indirect) steps. I shall first examine the verses at issue in their immediate context. Because a detailed treatment of Jas 4,1-6 is beyond the scope of this article, attention will be paid solely to some basic points. I shall also address the relevant background of Jas 4,1-6, found in Jas 1,13-21. As will be supported by the discussion below, there is an undeniable relationship between these two sections (section 2). I next focus upon Jas 1,13-21 and ascertain the section's close affinity with the particular wording of Did 3,1-6, a symmetrically patterned unit of five strophes called the *teknon* ("child") section (section 3). In a subsequent section, I will make clear that Did 3,1-6 exhibits many similarities with rabbinic literature and, especially, with the early layer of *Derekh Erets* tracts (section 4). The relevance of this phenomenon will become all the more evident in the ensuing section where I establish that these particular *Derekh Erets* materials also provide the most appropriate framework for understanding how James writes about the Law in 2,8-11 and 4,11-12 (section 5). Finally, I will focus on the verses at issue. A concluding section will reveal the close associations between Jas 4,1-4 and the Jewish moral tradition represented by Did 3,1-6. I address the question as to how James modified and radicalised this Jewish *Derekh Erets* tradition to fit his ideas (section 6).

## 2. *Jas 4,1-6 and its Relevant Background in Jas 1,13-21*

The passage in Jas 4,1-4 belongs to the division 4,1-6 which in turn is part of the coherent literary unit Jas 3,13-4,10. This unit which might be "the very heart of the epistle"<sup>(20)</sup> calls to conversion from one way of life to another. It is composed of four subsections: an exposition presenting the distinction James makes between two types of wisdom, the one from above and the other from below (3,13-18), the accusation where the author levels strong criticism against what can be labelled as a life led without wisdom (4,1-6), a call to repentance (4,7-10), and finally some concrete practical advice is given (4,11-12).

Having declared at the end of chapter 3 that true wisdom is peace, James begins in chapter 4 with some remarks about the origins of strife. "From where do wars and from where do battles among you come? Is it not from your desires (ἡδοναί) that are at war among your

<sup>(20)</sup> HARTIN, *James and the Q Sayings*, 31.



members”? He locates the origin of strife in the pursuit of pleasure<sup>(21)</sup>. The Greek text of the subsequent verse (Jas 4,2) is punctuated in the twenty-seventh revised edition of Nestle-Aland with commas dividing the sentence into three statements: “You desire (ἐπιθυμεῖτε) and do not have, you murder and are jealous (ζηλοῦτε) and are unable to obtain, you battle and wage war”. The word ἐπιθυμεῖν (and ἐπιθυμία) does not always have a bad meaning (Luke 22,15; Phil 1,23), but here, as most often in the New Testament, it refers to egocentric, illicit desire. It might therefore be preferable to translate ἐπιθυμεῖτε as “you desire evilly”<sup>(22)</sup>. The meanings of ζηλοῦν and ζήλος are equally important here. Although ζηλοῦν is itself neutral, it surely has a negative connotation here, expressing “jealousy”, “envy”. The expression “you are jealous” (ζηλοῦτε) deliberately picks up the theme established by 3,14-16.

Rather than pursuing one’s own desires, it is by asking God that one can receive gifts. Nevertheless, if one does not already live with the wisdom that comes down from God (1,17; 3,17), one will probably not turn to God to fulfil one’s needs. On the contrary, desire, a characteristic feature of the world, might easily infect the religious piety of community members so as to use their prayers to God for their own gain: “You ask and do not receive, because you ask wrongly in order to spend it on your desires” (4,3). In 4,4 James charges those who pursue their own desires with his harshest invective: being “adulteresses”.

In support of his argument stressing the need for a whole-hearted, unreserved commitment to God, James next turns to Scripture. He offers two quotations whose citation in 4,5 forms a thorny problem. God is probably the implied subject of κατώκισεν<sup>(23)</sup> since he caused the human spirit to reside within man (Gen 2,7; 6,17; 7,15; Ps 104,29-30; etc). The phrase “the spirit which he made to dwell in us” then

<sup>(21)</sup> The term ἡδονή usually means simply “pleasure”, but it is also found in the sense of “desire for pleasure”. The verb ἐπιθυμεῖν in the next verse clearly indicates the latter sense of ἡδονή here. It was the selfish, indulgent desire that was responsible for strife and wars; cf. Titus 3,3 which shows ἡδονή and ἐπιθυμία to be almost synonymous. Further, see JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 276; HARTIN, *James*, 196; R.W. WALL, *Community of the Wise*. The Letter of James (The New Testament in Context; Valley Forge, PA 1997) 195; JACKSON-MCCABE, *Logos and Law*, 202.

<sup>(22)</sup> See, with respect to Jas 1,14-15, JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 193-194. Cf. also HARTIN, *James*, 196.

<sup>(23)</sup> See DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James*, 163.

refers to the human spirit by which he has revitalized mankind. Jas 4,5 serves as a warning that if someone turns to the aims and values of the world, God's jealousy would be aroused. Yet in that situation God gives grace to the repentant. The quotation from Prov 3,34 (LXX) in 4,6 confirms that he "resists the proud, but gives grace to the humble".

Turning now to the first chapter of James' letter, it is important to notice first that the brief passages dedicated to various subject matters in Jas 1 serve to introduce the major themes subsequently expanded in the body of the letter. Sometimes it is even suggested that the opening chapter is the key to understanding the letter in its entirety. According to Luke T. Johnson, the chapter is "something of an *epitome* of the work as a whole" <sup>(24)</sup>. To be more specific with respect to our section, the contrast between God as the giver of gifts (of wisdom) and man's wicked desire (without wisdom) in 3,13-4,6 is introduced in 1,13-21. On the one hand, comprehension of the positive definition of wisdom in 3,13.17-18 emerges from the background in 1,16-18, while on the other hand the origin of strife located in the human pursuit of pleasure in 4,1-6 is reflected in the relationship between desire, sin, and death in 1,13-15.19-21 <sup>(25)</sup>.

Jas 1,13-15 rejects the idea of God's responsibility for the interior *πειρασμός*. It deepens the concept of *πειρασμός* by narrowing its focus from external circumstances, for example persecutions, to internal measurement, that is the difficulties of life itself including pressures, dangers and vicissitudes in general. The human reaction to this internal temptation is to blame God for the enticement to sin <sup>(26)</sup>. In fact, however, it is the human *ἐπιθυμία* that is actually responsible and this internal force puts the individual on the path of death. In 1,14-15 James champions man's accountability for sin and returns to this theme later in 4,1-4 where he makes this suggested criticism more concrete.

The passage in 1,16-18 gives a positive counterbalance to the negative statements in 1,13-15. In vv. 17-18, James removes God

<sup>(24)</sup> JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 174-175. Many other scholars "are convinced that ch. 1 holds the key to the letter's structure"; see TAYLOR, "Recent Scholarship", 112. We established above that James is a "redacted work", composed of traditional materials. This does necessarily imply, however, that the employment of these traditions lacks a coherent structure or literary design.

<sup>(25)</sup> Cf. JACKSON-MCCABE, *Logos and Law*, 206-208.

<sup>(26)</sup> HARTIN, *James*, 104; DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James*, 83-85; MOO, *The Epistle of James*, 71-72.

completely from this realm of human passion and destructiveness. Rather than testing his creatures, God sends them good things. James speaks of how “by his decision,” God “gave birth” to humans by a “word of truth”. The reversal with regard to 1,13-15 is complete. The meaning of this passage emerges from 3,13-18. Speaking of the divine wisdom giving birth, James uses ἀποκυέω (“to bear young”) instead of the more familiar synonym γεννάω or τίκτω. In our passage, he speaks about the λόγος by which God brings about a rebirth so that we are the “first fruits” of his creations “of truth” (1,18, ἀληθείας).

Verses 1,19-21 begin with the address: “my beloved brothers and sisters”, employing thus the same vocative used at the beginning of 1,16-18. In 1,19-20 the initial result of human ἐπιθυμία is specified as anger (ὀργή)<sup>(27)</sup>: “Know this, my beloved brethren, let every man be quick to hear, slow to speak, slow to anger, for the anger of man does not work the righteousness of God”. A further observation crucial to the remainder of this paper, is that it is not just the particular detail of the general passage in Jas 1,14-15 — which in 1,19d-20 is spelled out as ὀργή — that connects the two passages, but also the formal characteristic of the figure. The form of each of the two passages is best designated as concatenation because they show the repetition of one word from the preceding phrase in the phrase which follows it<sup>(28)</sup>. In Jas 1,14-15 the catenated form of “desire” and “sin” lead to death while the chain-syllogism in Jas 1,19-20 draws attention to the result of anger. Since v. 19 of this unit deals with speech, it is probably a sudden outburst of impetuous anger against another Christian which is meant. The angry eruption according to v. 20 does not produce the type of righteousness which reflects the standard God set for humanity.

<sup>(27)</sup> According to WALL, *Community of the Wise*, 192-247, James 4,1-5,6 elaborates on this third member of this triadic proverb: “quick to hear, slow to speak, slow to anger”. Each of the three exhortations of this proverb “supplies the thematic interest or orienting concern for each of the three successive units that make up the composition’s main body: ‘quick to hear’ is explained in 1:22-2:26, ‘slow to speak’ in 3:1-18, and ‘slow to anger’ in 4:1-5:6” (69).

<sup>(28)</sup> On the chain-saying form, cf. DIBELIUS, *James*, 94-99; J. MARTY, *l’Épître de Jacques: étude critique* (Paris 1935) 35. Of course, Jas 1,2-4 shows in concatenated form how endurance under testing comes to perfection, while 1,12-15 employs the exact same concepts. “Something similar is found in Jas 1:2-4: the climax, which is presented in the form of a catena, properly reads ‘trials’ – ‘endurance’ – ‘perfection’ (πειρασμοί – ὑπομονή – τελειότης)” but “the passage in Jas 1:14, 15, which we took as our point of departure, offers a purer form of the catena” (see DIBELIUS, *James*, 97).

Jas 1,19-21 exhibits a pattern strikingly similar to 1 Peter 1,23-2,2<sup>(29)</sup>. The fact that James and 1 Peter share the word “to put away” (ἀποτίθεμαι) even supports the idea that they rely upon a common tradition. All filthiness, ῥυπαρία, metaphorically indicating evil habits and inclinations, must be discarded like filthy garments (Jas 2,2) and the “implanted word” which is able to save must be “received in meekness” (1,21). The Greek noun πραύτης (“meekness”) is contrasted with ὀργή (“anger”) rather than with κακίας (“wickedness”)<sup>(30)</sup>. Verses 1,16-18 and 1,19-21 confirm that the “logos of truth” and “the implanted logos” are one and the same<sup>(31)</sup>. The “implanted word” does not refer to an inborn, natural quality within man but to wisdom as the greatest gift of God<sup>(32)</sup>. It descends from above (3,15; cf. 1,17). The person is being regenerated and reborn by the word of truth (1,18) as well as transformed by the implanted word (1,21).

### 3. Jas 1,13-21 in the Light of Did 3,1-6

Particularly similar to James’ teaching in 1,13-15.19-21 is the so-called *teknon* section in Did 3,1-6 which belongs to the Greek Two Ways<sup>(33)</sup>. At first sight one is inclined to consider the verses of the

<sup>(29)</sup> For further details, see also M.-E. BOISMARD, “Une liturgie baptismale dans la prima Petri. II. – Son influence sur l’épître de Jacques”, *RB* 64 (1957) 161-183; esp. 167-172.

<sup>(30)</sup> DIBELIUS, *James*, 112; HARTIN, *James*, 97. Cf. JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 270.

<sup>(31)</sup> “The identification of the ‘logos’ of truth and the ‘implanted logos’ is widely assumed”; cf. JACKSON-MCCABE, *Logos and Law*, 214, n. 91. See also BAUCKHAM, *James*, 146; HARTIN, *James and the Q Sayings*, 106, 213; JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 287; HARTIN, *James*, 106.

<sup>(32)</sup> “From 1:5 and 1:17, the reader recognizes this ‘wisdom from above’ as the wisdom that comes from God, indeed as the ‘word of truth’ that comes from God (1:18) and, as ‘implanted word’, is to be received in ‘meekness’(1:21)”; see JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 287 and compare 218; cf. HARTIN, *James and the Q Sayings*, 106-107, 213; DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James*, 51-55; HARTIN, *James*, 79-80 and WALL, *Community of the Wise*, 67.

<sup>(33)</sup> The *teknon* section is missing, however, in the *Letter of Barnabas*. On the other hand, it is found in the *Didache*, *Doctrina Apostolorum* (though this version lacks a counterpart to Did 3,3-4a), the *Apostolic Church Order*, the *Epitome of the Canons of the Holy Apostles*, the *Life of Shenoute*, etc. It may be argued with equal reason, therefore, that Barnabas, who probably rewrote his source, did not preserve these materials. See also VAN DE SANDT-FLUSSER, *The Didache*, 73-74, 133-134.

*teknon* (“child”) section as wisdom instruction transmitted by older men, matured by experience, to the younger generation. The passage consists of five small textual units, each of which is constructed on the same plan. Its style differs noticeably from the immediate context in that the precepts are formulated here in terms of warm encouragement. The unit consists of five small strophes, each structured according to the same distinctive, symmetrical pattern not present elsewhere in the Two Ways.

The separate strophes in 3,2-6 display a particular repetitive pattern in that each is divided into two parallel halves. The implied reference here is to the division of the commandments into commands of greater and lesser importance, or easier and more difficult. The first half contains a warning against a specific minor transgression because such a sin, so it says, “leads to” a major transgression. Then in the second half an admonishment is offered against two or more lesser sins, for these too “give birth to” a major transgression. With respect to the content of James’ letter we render the first three verses:

- (3,1) My child, flee from all evil and from everything resembling it.
- (3,2)
  - a. Be not angry (μὴ γίνου ὀργίλος),
  - b. for anger (ὀργή) leads to murder (φόνον),
  - c. nor jealous (μηδὲ ζηλωτής) nor irascible (μηδὲ ἐριστικός) nor hot-tempered (μηδὲ θυμικός)
  - d. for from these murders are born (φόνοι γεννῶνται).
- (3,3)
  - a. My child, be not desiring (μὴ γίνου ἐπιθυμητής),
  - b. for desire (ἐπιθυμία) leads to fornication (πορνείαν),
  - c. nor foul-mouthed nor indiscreetly peering
  - d. for from all these adulteries are born (μοιχεῖαι γεννῶνται).

In two clauses (a and c) minor transgressions are mentioned which “lead to” or “give birth to” major sins (b and d). Unlike the variety of minor transgressions in the two halves of the separate strophes, the same weighty offence is retained in each of the two halves, with the exception of 3,3, where the major transgression is expressed in two different words (“fornication” and “adultery”)<sup>(34)</sup>. The connection with the Decalogue commandments is clear enough as murder and adultery are quickly and easily associated with the second table of the Ten Commandments.

<sup>(34)</sup> The weighty transgressions or sins occurring in this section, then, are murder (3,2), fornication and adultery (3,3), idolatry (3,4), theft (3,5) and blasphemy (3,6).

In order to prove the relevance of the *teknon* section to the Letter of James, our initial concern must be to establish connections. Let us consider Jas 1,14-15 first. Three points may be noted at this stage. First, in both James and the *teknon* section the vice ἐπιθυμία is found. Whereas the noun ἐπιθυμία and the adjective ἐπιθυμητής in Did 3,3 describe specifically sexual passions, the context of the word ἐπιθυμία in James suggests a broader conception. It appears to highlight individual responsibility for sin. In accordance with the *teknon* passage, however, the term's sexual connotation is developed in Jas 1,14-15 with vivid metaphors. "Desire" is personified as a seductive female who, having actively enticed the person referenced in v. 14, conceives a bastard child by him. Second, James describes the consequence of desire in terms of giving birth: personified Desire gives birth to (τίκτει) sin, and sin brings forth (ἀποκύει) death (1,15). The *teknon* section uses a similar "birthing" language in connection with the major sins in the second part (the "d" clauses) of its symmetrical strophes<sup>(35)</sup>. Third, both in Jas 1,14-15 and in the *teknon* section the concatenated form is found. Like Jas 1,14-15, the *teknon* section encapsulates its teaching in a chain-saying structure carrying the thought from step to step: "be not angry, for anger.." and "be not desiring, for desire..."

These examples taken together constitute an argument. Yet corroborative evidence is needed before we can be completely certain. Let us focus our interest on Jas 1,19-21. I shall first assess the relation between Jas 1,19d-20 and the *teknon* section, and then discuss v. 21 and its counterparts. I established above that the statements in Jas 1,19d-20 give some detailed information about the content of ἐπιθυμία mentioned in 1,14-15. Of particular interest is also that the statement in 1,19d-20 is shaped in the form of a chain-saying: "(Let every man be) slow to anger (ὀργήν), for the anger (ὀργή) of man does not work the righteousness of God". The clauses might easily recall Did 3,2ab: "Be not angry (μὴ γίνου ὀργίλος), for anger (ὀργή) leads to murder (φόνον). One could admittedly argue that the phrase is too general to carry much weight here as warnings against anger frequently occur in

<sup>(35)</sup> As seen above, however, James prefers the terms τίκτω and ἀποκύω in this context rather than the usual verb γεννάω as employed in the *teknon* section. He keeps restating his source in his own words and thus developed it as his own teaching; KLOPPENBORG, "The Reception of the Jesus Traditions", 116-121. The verb ἀποκύω ("to bear young") is also used in 1,18 but with respect to the unusual female image for God as "the father of light" who gives birth.

gnomic literature. The book of Proverbs portrays anger to be hazardous since it leads to evil consequences (6,34; 15,1; 16,14; 27,4; 29,22) while other parallels are found in early Jewish and early Christian literature<sup>(36)</sup>. Against this objection, however, it might be argued that the third clause of this directive (“slow to anger”) “breaks the grammatical pattern” of Jas 1,19<sup>(37)</sup>. A noun replaces the expected infinitive here and the Greek article τό is dropped. This unevenness may indicate that James links up here with an admonition like the one in the *tekon* section, the more so since each of these warnings is located at a key position in the two texts. Just as condemnation of anger in Jas 1,19d is the first ingredient of ἐπιθυμία, so the admonition against anger in the Did 3,2 is found right after the general introduction in 3,1.

Turning now to Jas 1,21, it is first of all the Greek text that deserves attention. At variance with the punctuation in the text of Nestle-Aland (27<sup>th</sup> ed.), it is preferable to place a comma after κακίας. By dividing the sentence this way, the virtue of meekness (21b) is in strong contrast with ὀργή (anger)<sup>(38)</sup> rather than with κακίας. The “implanted word” is to be received in “meekness”. More will be said on this shortly. For now we should note that Jas 1,21 reflects elements of the *tekon* section in the Two Ways. First, the admonition to rid oneself of all filthiness and the abundance of wickedness (περισσεῖαν κακίας) in 1,21a might echo the preoccupation in the introduction in Did 3,1. In Jas 1,21a the expression περισσεῖαν κακίας (literally “overflowing” of wickedness) does not make good sense after the appeal to put away πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν. Why did the author deem it necessary to add this wording after πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν (“all meanness”)? Literally ῥυπαρία means physical dirt or filth (as the adjective used in Jas 2,2) but here it stands for what is ethically offensive as “baseness”, “meanness” or “ignobility”<sup>(39)</sup>. The expression πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν itself refers to everything below the accepted standards of human worth and dignity. The parallel vice catalogue in 1 Pet 2,1 appears more appropriate: “So put away all malice (πᾶσαν κακίαν), and all deceit

<sup>(36)</sup> Etc. in D.B. DEPPE, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James* (Diss.; Chelsea, MI 1989) 79-80; cf. also JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 199.

<sup>(37)</sup> JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 199.

<sup>(38)</sup> See the references in n. 30, above. Cf. also W.R. BAKER, *Personal Speech-Ethics in the Epistle of James* (WUNT II/68; Tübingen 1995) 89.

<sup>(39)</sup> The word might be equivalent to the Semitic כִּיעוּר (“ugliness”); see below, n. 50.



(πάντα δόλον) and hypocrisy (ὑποκρίσεις) and envy (φθόνους) and all slander (πάσας καταλαλιὰς)". The negative attitude toward society is specified in order to arouse the readers to leave their antisocial tendencies behind and become aware of their Christian duty.

The expression περισσεῖαν κακίας in James, however, is hardly a detailed description of the previous πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν. It is therefore conceivable that rather than using περισσεῖα in the sense of "overflowing", James has employed the word in another meaning of the "perisseu"-stem, that is, "remainder" (cf. περίσσευμα in Mark 8,8). The translation of the phrase περισσεῖαν κακίας as "every trace of malice" might therefore be preferable<sup>(40)</sup>. If this is correct, however, it would not only fit the context neatly, but also precisely render the point made in Did 3,1: "my child, flee from all evil (ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ) and from anything resembling it" (καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὁμοίου αὐτοῦ). The central moral preventative of Did 3,1-6 is to avoid anything resembling evil. In addition to Jas 1,21, 1 Pet 2,1 also seems to reflect the maxim in Did 3,1. The form of the tradition in James, however, is closer to Did 3,1 than that in 1 Peter which apparently has been reworked and elaborated.

Another aspect of Jas 1,21 requires comment here. Salvation comes through the "implanted word" which must be "received in meekness" (1,21b). The pre-eminent characteristic of wisdom in James is "meekness"<sup>(41)</sup>. Since anger blocks the path to righteousness, one should avoid anything resembling evil and instead be meek. In Jas 1,20-21 meekness is morally contrasted with anger. This contrast returns in Jas 3,13-18 when James makes the distinction between two types of wisdom: from above and from below. A humble and simple dependence upon God is needed since wisdom from above only finds a true home in the lives of the meek (3,13). The εἰ δέ introduction in 3,14 contrasts the desirable πραύτητι with the ζήλον in the ensuing verse.

A similar antagonism is found in the Two Ways as well. The virtue

<sup>(40)</sup> Cf. DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James*, 94. See also the following statement: "As parallel uses of *perisseia* (literally 'abundance / overflowing') suggest, its main function here is rhetorical: with *pasa* it extends the negative admonition to every form of wickedness (see Rom 5:17; 2 Cor 8:2; 10:15)"; JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 201. And compare the following: "This meaning ('remainder') cannot be demonstrated for *perisseia* but can be for the noun *perisseuma*. It is an attractive proposal in that it would firmly establish that James is speaking to incomplete Christians"; BAKER, *Personal Speech-Ethics*, 90, n. 13.

<sup>(41)</sup> HARTIN, *James*, 97, 191-193; 216.

of meekness is a special theme in Did 3,7-10, a separate unit which differs in form and focus from the former (*teknon*) section<sup>(42)</sup>. The *teknon* piece and its sequel taken together (Did 3,1-10) likewise suggest an appeal to put aside anger in favour of meekness. The first segment, containing warnings (3,1-6) after the preamble in Did 3,1, begins with cautioning against ὀργή, while the second segment, articulating merely positive exhortations, commences as follows: “But (δέ) be meek (πραύς), since those who are meek (πραεῖς) will inherit the (holy / ἁγίαν)<sup>(43)</sup> land”. The humble man puts his trust in God rather than in selfishly motivated, harsh and violent anger.

The conclusion to be drawn from this evidence<sup>(44)</sup> is that when these parallels are considered together the general case for a relationship between Jas 1,13-15.19-21 and Did 3,1-6 seems strong.

#### 4. Did 3,1-6: a Re-orientation of Halakha in Line with Early Derekh Erets

We have thus far dealt with the relationship between Jas 1,13-21 and Did 3,1-6. Jas 1,13-21 should be considered the backdrop of Jas 4,1-6 and the passage simultaneously shows a close relationship with the *teknon* section in Did 3,1-6. How does the *teknon* section help solve the exegetical difficulties of Jas 4,1-4? Should we assume that it is coincidence that James displays parallels with a short, early Christian manual? Why would this section or a similar tradition be of relevance to James?

The concept Did 3,1-6 presupposes is the common Jewish

<sup>(42)</sup> The unit is the first part of a section in Did 3,7–4,14 dominated by instructions about constructive social behaviour: “Nach einem Lasterkatalog (Did 3,1-6) steht an der Spitze einer Reihe von Geboten eine Mahnung zur Sanftmut Did 3,7. Durch δέ wird der Gegensatz zu den vorher genannten Lastern markiert. Gefordert wird die Sanftmut (πραύς) im Gegensatz zum Zorn (ὀργηλός)”; cf. H. LOHMANN, *Drohung und Verheissung*. Exegetische Untersuchungen zur Eschatologie bei den Apostolischen Vätern (BZNW 55; Berlin 1987) 38.

<sup>(43)</sup> The Didache omits the specification “holy” in 3,7. In our reconstruction of the GTW (see above, n. 2) we chose to follow here the Latin Doctrina 3,7 (“Eso autem mansuetus, quia mansueti possidebunt sanctam terram”) and thus to supply the adjective “holy” which by implication suggests the object of the promise to be the physical land of Israel. See further VAN DE SANDT – FLUSSER, *The Didache*, 134-135.

<sup>(44)</sup> See also the clause Γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου in 1,22: “Be doers of the word!” The verb γίνεσθαι (usually: “to become”) occurring here as a substitute for εἶναι (“to be”), might be an echo of the admonishments in Did 3,2-6 which all begin with μὴ γίνου.

distinction between minor and major commandments. A minimalistic understanding of the major commandments is rejected since the passage not only requires strict observance of the major precepts, but also adherence to the minor commandments as well<sup>(45)</sup>. This ethical sensitivity which includes more than is explicitly obligatory or permitted by specific rules might have aroused James' interest in the *teknon* section. It seems to represent James' own viewpoint at least. His letter seeks ethical perfection (1,4.17.25; 2,8.22; 3,2) and whole-hearted devotion to God (1,8; 4,8). It rebukes those with divided loyalties (*ibid.*), who have become "friends of the world" and emphasizes obedience to the Law (2,8-11) without wavering between loyalty to God and loyalty to the world (4,4).

Focus on the minor commandments is expressed in the introductory sentence of the *teknon* section as follows: "my child, flee from all evil and from anything resembling it" (3,1). A similar statement can be found in rabbinic literature<sup>(46)</sup>, pre-eminently in the refined ethics represented by the rabbinic *Derekh Erets* tractates. The injunction to avoid anything similar to iniquity serves as a résumé of

<sup>(45)</sup> As a matter of fact, further elaboration of the topic is found in the Hellenistic milieu of the Jewish Diaspora and in rabbinic literature. For Philo, the observance of the light commandments is as essential as having no basic part removed or destroyed from a building; cf. *De Legatione ad Gaium*, 117; see also Philo's *Allegorical Interpretation*, III, 241; further, compare I. HEINEMANN, *Philo's griechische und jüdische Bildung*. Kulturvergleichende Untersuchungen zu Philons Darstellung der jüdischen Gesetze (Breslau 1932; repr. Hildesheim 1962) 478-480. An equally strict or even more rigorous attitude is found in rabbinic sources: "Ben Azzai said: Run to fulfil the lightest precept even as the weightiest and flee from transgression; for one precept draws another precept in its train, and one transgression draws another transgression in its train; for the reward of a precept (done) is a precept (to be done), and the reward of one transgression is (another) transgression". Cf. m. Av 4,2; see G.F. MOORE, *Judaism in the first Centuries of the Christian Era*. The Age of the Tannaim (Cambridge, MA 1927) I, 470-471. See also the instances in m. Av 2,1; cf. b. Men 44a, top; b. Ned 39b; y. Pea 1,15d. An echo of the rabbinic usage of "light" and "weighty" precepts is also found in the wording of Jesus: "... and you have neglected the weightier matters of the Law (βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου) ..." (Matt 23,23b). About the concept of the light commandment being as important as a weighty one, cf. Str-B, I, 900-905; esp. 901-902; E.E. URBACH, *The Sages – Their Concepts and Beliefs* 1 (Jerusalem 1975) 345-350.

<sup>(46)</sup> "For R. Eliezer did teach: 'one should always flee from what is hideous and from whatever seems hideous'" and : "But the Sages said: 'Keep distant from what is hideous and from whatever seems hideous'" ; cf. t. Hul 2,24 (cf. Zuck. 503) and t. Yev 4,7 (cf. Zuck. 245), respectively.

moral codes in the *Derekh Erets* tractates<sup>(47)</sup>. Oral tracts with subjects concerning *Derekh Erets* existed as early as the second century CE and part of these writings reflect the teachings of the pious on moral behaviour<sup>(48)</sup>. These men constituted a concrete group within the society of the rabbis, practising charities, performing deeds of lovingkindness, and possessing virtues of dedication to humility and modesty. The treatise *Yir'at Het* ("fear of transgression"), a separate denotation of chapters I-IV and IX of the *Derekh Erets Zuta*, probably dates from Tannaitic times<sup>(49)</sup>. It states:

Keep aloof from everything hideous and from whatever seems hideous<sup>(50)</sup> (הרחק מן הכיעור ומן הדומה לו) lest others suspect you of transgression (*Yir'at Het* I,13)<sup>(51)</sup>.

<sup>(47)</sup> Cf. G. KLEIN, *Der älteste christliche Katechismus und die jüdische Propaganda-Literatur* (Berlin 1909) 69: "Die kürzeste Formel für *Derekh erez* lautet: Halte dich fern von der Sünde und von dem, was hässlich ist".

<sup>(48)</sup> The early layer reflects a life-style which is called "*derekh hasidut*", the way of the pious. It reveals the teaching of the early Hasidim who "placed extreme stress on self-deprival and the performance of good deeds and acts of loving kindness in lieu of pure academic 'ivory tower' scholarship"; M. B. LERNER, "The External Tractates", *The Literature of the Sages* (ed. S. SAFRAI) (CRI II/ 3; Assen – Maastricht – Philadelphia 1987) I, 367-404; esp. 380. See also S. SAFRAI, "Teaching of Pietists in Mishnaic Literature", *JJS* 16 (1965) 15-33; esp. 25-28; ID., "Hasidim we-Anshei Maase", *Zion* 50 (1984-1985) 133-154; ID., "Jesus and the Hasidim", *Jerusalem Perspective* 42-44 (1994) 3-22; ID., "Jesus and the Hasidic Movement" (Hebr.), *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World. Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (eds. I.M. GAFNI – A. OPPENHEIMER – D.R. SCHWARTZ) (Jerusalem 1996) 413-436. See also VAN DE SANDT – FLUSSER, *The Didache*, 165-169 and 172-173.

<sup>(49)</sup> The early (Tannaitic) part of *Yir'at Het* is identical with *Massechet Derekh Erets Zuta*, Chaps. I-III (minus I,18-20), edited by M. VAN LOOPIK, *The Ways of the Sages and the Way of the World* (TSAJ 26; Tübingen 1991) 172-251 (with commentary) = *Massekhet Derekh Eretz*, Chaps. I-II, edited by M. HIGGER, *The Treatises Derek Erez: Masseket Derek Erez; Pirke Ben Azzai; Tosefta Derek Erez* (New York 1935; repr. Jerusalem 1970) I, 55-96 (Hebr.) and II, 33-42 (English translation). Cf. VAN LOOPIK, *The Ways*, 9 and 16-17.

<sup>(50)</sup> The rule of refraining from anything hideous (כיעור) reflects a strongly ethical approach, an attitude that is inspired by a deeply rooted fear of sin. For the term כיעור ("ugliness") as ethically offensive, see the warning in *Seder Eliahu Rabba*, Chap. 2: "for ugly things (דברים מכוערים) that aren't fitting" (cf. M. FRIEDMANN, *Seder Eliahu Rabba and Seder Eliahu Zuta* [Jerusalem 1969] 13); cf. also SER, Chap. 25 (cf. *ibid.*, 139); Chap. 7 (cf. *ibid.*, 32); Chap. 14 (cf. *ibid.*, 67); Chap. 18 (cf. *ibid.*, 104). The term corresponds with the literal meaning of its Greek counterpart in Jas 1,21: διὸ ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν ("therefore, having put away all filthiness...").

<sup>(51)</sup> According to VAN LOOPIK, *The Ways*, 194-197 (with commentary) =

The desire to abstain from evil incited pietistic Sages to keep to not only the literal meaning of a commandment but also its broad intention, surpassing the scope of widely accepted precepts. It exceeds the halakha's legal corpus. Certain things, not forbidden by the Law, were taken in these pious circles to be actual transgressions and are referred to as minor sins. Conversely, the current halakhic norms were tightened to the extent that they became minor commands in their own right. The early stratum of *Derekh Erets* literature embodied a refined human ethic highlighting acts of charity, modesty, humility. The most pertinent parallel to the preamble in Did 3,1 and the subsequent strophes in 3,2-6 is found in the treatise *Yir'at Het* II,16-17:

Keep aloof from that which leads to transgression, keep aloof from everything hideous and from what even seems hideous. Shudder from committing a minor transgression (מחשׂא הקל), lest it leads you to commit a major transgression (לחשׂא חמור). Hurry to (perform) a minor precept (למצוה קלה), for this will lead you to (perform) a major precept (חמורה)<sup>(52)</sup>.

This shows that the popular apophthegm, to be as careful of an unimportant precept as of an important one<sup>(53)</sup>, was in its original meaning an alternative form of the counsel “my child, flee from all evil and from anything resembling it”. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that Did 3,1-6 displays a tradition which was very much alive in Jewish *Derekh Erets* circles. James was interested in such a tradition as it embodied a teaching preserved and handed on by pious Jews in his time.

The agreement between the maxims in *Yir'at Het* I,13; II,16-17 and Did 3,1 is not surprising, since there is a close affinity between the ideas and ethical principles in the early *Derekh Erets* doctrine and the

---

Massekhet *Derekh Erets* I, 12 according to HIGGER, *The Treatises Derek Erez*, I, 63 (Hebr.) and 2, 35 (English translation). Compare also the following saying: “Keep aloof from anything hideous and (even) from whatever seems hideous”; cf. *Derekh Erets Zuta* VIII, 3 according to VAN LOOPIK, *The Ways*, 290 = Massekhet *Derekh Eretz* VII, 2 according to HIGGER, *The Treatises Derek Erez* I, 126 [Hebr.] and II, 50 [English translation]).

<sup>(52)</sup> *Yir'at Het* (or *Derekh Erets Zuta*) II, 16-17 according to VAN LOOPIK, *The Ways*, 229-231 (with commentary) = Massekhet *Derekh Eretz* I, 26 according to HIGGER, *The Treatises Derek Erez* I, 78-79 [Hebr.] and 2, 38 [ET]).

<sup>(53)</sup> See F. BÖHL, *Gebotserschwerung und Rechtsverzicht als ethisch-religiöse Normen in der rabbinischen Literatur* (FJS 1; Freiburg i. B. 1971) 59-63 and 85-109.

views occurring in the Greek tractate of the Two Ways<sup>(54)</sup>. The pietistic *Derekh Erets* does not refer to such unique Jewish commandments as circumcision, dietary restrictions, clothing restraints or observance of the Sabbath and festivals. Nor does it display the style of halakhic discussion characteristic to most rabbinic literature or, by way of specific example, a letter from Qumran such as 4QMMT which meticulously discusses the specificities of the Torah or precisely spells out what each commandment requires in specific circumstances. It is not a strict legal, halakhic approach to the Law which is emphasized but a moral, personal and ethical attitude to life. In the following sections I shall make clear that paraenetic materials in James belong to this particular tradition as part of a developing Jewish stream of thought.

#### 5. *An Approach to the Law in Jas 2,8-11 in Line with Early Derekh Erets*

The main section on the law in James' letter is 2,8-11<sup>(55)</sup>. The passage shows a similar ethical interest in the law as does the segment found in Did 3,1-6 and the ancient kernel of *Derekh Erets* literature as well. The text runs as follows:

8. If you really fulfil the royal Law according to the Scripture, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself", you do well. 9. But if you show partiality, you commit a sin, and are convicted by the law as transgressors. 10. For whoever keeps the whole law but fails in one point has become guilty of all of it. 11. For he who said, "Do not commit adultery", also said, "Do not kill". If you do not commit adultery but do kill, you have become a transgressor of the Law.

These verses are part of James' powerful, coherent argument against all forms of partiality or favouritism. In Jas 2,1-5 readers are warned not to practice favouritism in their assemblies. The proof comes in two main sections, vv. 5-7 and vv. 8-11 and we find a renewed admonition in 2,12-13. The first section endorsing the argument consists of three rhetorical questions (vv. 5-6a, 6b, 7) each of which anticipates an affirmative response. The second section seeks to prove that a sin such as is represented by "partiality" (προσωπολημψία), is a violation of the Torah (vv. 8-11). Apparently the readers of the letter did not experience it that way.

<sup>(54)</sup> See VAN DE SANDT – FLUSSER, *The Didache*, 172-179.

<sup>(55)</sup> According to Wachob (*The Voice of Jesus*, 127) Jas 2,1-13 "is the Jamesian argument that says more about the law than any other in the letter".

James sets the royal love commandment as a significant criterion by which all action should be measured. The contrast between v. 8 and v. 9 is that of “really” keeping the law of love (v. 8), while at the same time disobeying one of its provisions (v. 9). He emphasizes that those who claim to live within the kingdom defined by the “royal” law of love cannot practice partiality. The halakha was to be expounded within the parameters of the love commandment, but the prominence of love does not nullify concern for the observance of specific regulations and precepts. In James’ opinion observance of the Torah without love is as inconceivable as the neglect of minor commandments.

In 2,10-11 James argues that failure to obey even “one point” (ἐν ἐνί) of the law is to be guilty of all of it. In fact he agrees with a traditional Jewish view that “whoever violates one commandment, will end up by violating them all”<sup>(56)</sup>, as proven by v. 11. As long as commandments are viewed as nothing more than a series of individual commands, it is possible to think that disobedience to any particular commandment entailed being guilty of having violated that commandment only. James, however, emphasizes obedience to the entire law which is to be fulfilled in all its parts. The Torah is indivisible. The command against partiality (ἐν ἐνί) is connected explicitly with the above mentioned standard Jewish view that the law is to be considered a unity. James suggests that favouritism be condemned as severely by the law as the major transgressions of adultery or even murder. This argument concurs with the common Jewish distinction between minor and major commandments<sup>(57)</sup>. Seemingly negligible minor commandments, like the instruction against partiality, are to be included within the scope of the commandment “do not commit adultery” and “do not kill”.

In another passage of James focussing on the law, a prohibition against slander is found. In 4,11-12 it reads:

Do not speak evil against one another, brethren. He that speaks evil against a brother or judges his brother, speaks evil against the law and judges the law. But if you judge the law, you are not a doer of the law but a judge. There is one lawgiver and judge, he who is able to save and destroy. But who are you that you judge your neighbour?

<sup>(56)</sup> See for instance DIBELIUS, *James*, 144-146 with reference to b. Hor 8b and elsewhere. See also Y. BAER, “The Historical Foundations of the Halakha”, *Zion* 27 (1962) 127-128 (Hebr.).

<sup>(57)</sup> See DIBELIUS, *James*, 144-145 and n. 113; MOO, *The Epistle of James*, 95.



One cannot pick and choose which commandments to keep. It is utterly wrong to disregard some prohibitions while obeying the others. Slandering is likely to have been taken as a minor transgression. According to James, however, one sets oneself above the Law in deciding which commands to comply with and which to ignore<sup>(58)</sup>. Anyone believing himself entitled to ignore the weight of a minor sin like slander claims for himself God's role as the ultimate lawgiver.

James shows great interest in highly developed ethical behaviour. The core of his message is that equating the insignificance of a seemingly lesser offence with the gravity of the major ones entails a definite shift in moral focus and attitude beneficial to one's neighbour. The subsections in Jas 2,8-11 and 4,11-12 are thus most naturally in accordance with Did 3,1-6 and Yir'at Het. In Douglas J. Moo's view, these words of warning were indispensable "because of the tendency to think that obedience to the "heavier" commandments outweighed any failure to adhere to the "lighter" requirements of the law"<sup>(59)</sup>. Since his readers might have lost the ability to properly assess the value of the minor commandments, James cuts away any grounds the person may have for a light-hearted attitude toward prohibitions of partiality or slander. There was no room for excuses or justifications, by emphasizing for example that one was, after all, keeping the Decalogue very well. The observance of all laws, regardless of their content and their relation to the centre of Torah, is explicitly demanded. In James' mind, "to show contempt for the poor is equivalent to committing adultery or even murder"<sup>(60)</sup>. In this respect, he is strongly rooted in the specific moral tradition thriving in pious Jewish groups.

#### 6. *Jas 4,1-4: an Interpretation in the Light of Did 3,1-6*

In the first chapter of James (1,14-15) evil is explained as the product of an individual's "desires" (ἐπιθυμίας). Also in Jas 4,1-4, the connection between desire and sin is shown. In the first subsection below, we will see that both passages, Jas 1,14-15 and 4,1-4, at least partially, seem to correspond closely to a pattern of moral exhortation like the one presented in the *teknon* section. Yet, as will become clear

<sup>(58)</sup> See also B.T. VIVIANO, "La Loi parfaite de liberté. Jacques 1,25 et la Loi", *The Catholic Epistles* (ed. SCHLOSSER), 213-226; esp. 223-224.

<sup>(59)</sup> *The Epistle of James*, 95.

<sup>(60)</sup> Cf. HARTIN, *James*, 137. See also the Venerable BEDE (672/3-735) who states that "if one practices partiality, then it is the same as if one had committed murder or adultery" (according to JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 233).

in the second part of this section, there are also major points in which James surpasses the Two Ways imagery.

a) Conformity

In Jas 4,1 conflicting selfish desires (minor vice) are the source of wars and battles (major offences). James probably rearranged traditional material here by rephrasing it in rhetorical questions, a stylistic feature frequently found in this letter<sup>(61)</sup>. In consonance with the tendency exhibited in Did 3,1-6, however, he asserts that hedonistic pleasures and internal passions lead to violence<sup>(62)</sup>.

This very same pattern probably underlies Jas 4,2 as well. In order to see this, the two phrases (“you murder” and “you battle and wage war”) are to be regarded as resulting from the preceding observations in this verse, namely, “you desire” and “you are jealous”. Modern editions of the Greek New Testament, however, do not support this conclusion. Instead of a coherent literary pattern substantiating this line of thought, Jas 4,2 often is divided into three disconnected statements:

You desire (ἐπιθυμεῖτε) and do not have  
you murder and are jealous (ζηλοῦτε) and are unable to obtain  
you battle and wage war.

The structure of the passage evidences the haphazard arrangement of a number of isolated vices and severe misdemeanours which are apparently applicable to the community. Moreover, the expression “you murder” does not fit well with the following “you are jealous” (ζηλοῦτε). The difficulties resolve themselves when assuming that the author in Jas 4,2 does indeed follow up on ideas in Jas 1,13-15.19-21. This is reflected in the Greek text when a full stop is placed after “you murder”:

- a. You desire and do not have, (so) you murder.
- b. And you are jealous and are unable to obtain, (so) you battle and wage war.

The punctuation adopted here breaks the verse into two statements,

<sup>(61)</sup> Compare also the rhetorical questions in 2,4.5.6.7.14.15.16. etc. Note the wording ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν as well. This might refer to Jas 3,5, where it says: “the tongue is a small member (μικρὸν μέλος), yet it boasts of great things”.

<sup>(62)</sup> Because the terms ἐπιθυμεῖν and ζηλοῦν were used interchangeably in his days (cf. JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 271; JACKSON-MCCABE, *Logos and Law*, 204), James might have understood the term ζηλωτής in the *teknon* section as “jealous” or “desirous”.

each including a cause and effect<sup>(63)</sup>. Luke T. Johnson has demonstrated that in Hellenistic literature “envy” (φθόνος) and “jealousy” (ζήλος) inevitably lead to hostile acts, such as quarrels, wars, and murder<sup>(64)</sup>. The latter concepts are standard features of this *topos*. In fact, envy is constantly associated with wars and battles.

For our purposes, however, it is of far greater importance to note that the above Hellenistic *topos* closely corresponds with the form of moral exhortation in the *teknon* passage. The connection between envy, jealousy, and murder is also found in Did 3,1-6. As seen above, the latter section is bent on highlighting that the transgression of minor precepts leads to the transgression of major ones. In Jas 4,2 the same path is depicted: “desire eventuates in murder” and “jealousy results in war”. In addition to these statements, a psychological judgment is also found here explaining the transition from a minor to a major sin. The additions “(you) do not have” and “(you) are unable to obtain” in 4,2 indicate that desires for pleasure and passions are unsatisfied and thus eventually lead to murder, social upheaval, battles and war.

James’ awareness of a tradition like the *teknon* section is evidenced not only in Jas 4,1-2 but also in the entire arrangement of Jas 4,1-4. The author reserves some of his harshest invectives for those who pursue their own desires, addressing them as “adulteresses” (μοιχαλίδες). In Did 3,2-3 being angry, jealous, eager for battle and hot-tempered are all connected to murder, while a lascivious or lustful person (ἐπιθυμητής) is tied to adultery (μοιχεία)<sup>(65)</sup> — these are the

<sup>(63)</sup> A similar punctuation can also be found in J.B. MAYOR, *The Epistle of St. James*. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Comments (1897; repr. Grand Rapids 1954) 134-137; J.H. ROPES, *The Epistle of St James* (ICC; Edinburgh 1916) 254; JOHNSON, *The Letter of James*, 267, 277 etc.

<sup>(64)</sup> “James 3:13-4:10 and the *Topos* περὶ φθόνου”, *NT* 25 (1983) 327-347; repr. in L.T. JOHNSON, *Brother of Jesus*, 182-201; ID., *The Letter of James*, 277. See also JACKSON-MCCABE, *Logos and Law*, 201-202; LAWS, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 171.

<sup>(65)</sup> Unlike the variety of minor transgressions in the two halves of the separate strophes, the same serious offence is repeatedly retained in each of the two halves, with the exception of 3,3, where the grave sin is expressed in two different words (“fornication” and “adultery”). It is, however, hard to believe that the term “fornication” was used in the earlier layer of GTW 3,1-6. The word πορνεία is commonly a translation of the Hebrew term זנות or a related form, which is used as technical terminology for prostitution. In the Torah — both oral and written — prostitution (זנות) is prohibited when sexual intercourse is involved with a cultic and / or commercial prostitute. There is no condemnation of sexual relations that do not violate the marriage bond. Pre-marital, non-commercial sexual intercourse between man and woman is not considered a moral crime in

topics treated by James in 1,14-15.19-20 and 4,1-4. It may be argued, then, that these verses are reminiscent of, and perhaps modelled after, a Jewish moral tradition similar to the *teknon* section. James lays bare the meaning of the requirements of the Law as seen through the eyes of pious Jewish Sages.

#### b) Radicalisation

Jas 4,1-4 is in agreement with contemporary Hellenistic authors and Did 3,1-6 in its emphasis on the fact that colliding selfish desires prepare the way for violence. Yet there are also essential differences. James deviates from the conventional topic by suggesting that these battles are being fought at this very same moment among the readers. In his letter it is not a potential but actual and tangible situation. Severe violence is already evident among them. The situation among his readers seems to have gotten seriously out of hand. He accuses his addressees of being engaged in wars and other conflicts (4,1-2). They are “killers” (4,2), “adulteresses” (4,4), sinners (4,8). How serious were the sins of these Christian readers?

Since James argued in 2,8-11 that breaking any command amounts to violating the whole law, it follows that the “minor sins” are judged in terms of the most extreme consequences possible. James understands the various paragraphs of the *teknon* section in the sense that all actions which potentially lead to strife, war, murder or adultery must be seen as being as equally grave as major transgressions. He assesses the minor sins of his addressees as being major transgressions. His readers should not think they can plead innocence. If they allow themselves to be carried away by their passions, give in to desires and are jealous, it is the same as if they had waged war or committed murder.

This radicalisation is also the setting which enables us to understand the straightforward accusation of “adultery” in 4,4. The label “adulteresses” applies not only to those who engage in the physical act of intercourse, but also to those who are covetous. They are adulterers because of their failure to resist “desire”. The choice of the specific

---

the Torah and contemporary Judaism (see, for example, B. MALINA, “Does *Porneia* mean Fornication?”, *NT* 14 [1972] 10-17). Although fornication (πορνεῖα) is presented as a grave sin in 3,3a, it is difficult to believe that the passage’s concern is with cultic or commercial sexual relations. It is therefore likely that the term in the first layer of this unit was adultery (μοιχεῖα), which also occurs in the second half of the present admonition.

wording was inspired by the major transgression in Did 3,3. James' discussion is based less on the supposed activities of his addressees than on his intensification of the argument in the *teknon* section. By equating the gravity of major legal transgressions and an obviously minor offence, he established a higher standard of liability for his readers<sup>(66)</sup>.

James' instruction is even more rigorous than the supra-legal conduct prevalent in the pious environment of the Hassidim and the teaching in Did 3,1-6. In the *Derekh Erets* the basic rule of avoiding minor offences is meant to prevent a person from indulging in major transgressions, thereby eliminating the root cause of murder and adultery, respectively. James starts from the other side. By stressing the major transgressions he makes clear that perpetrating major sins equals all attitudes and actions which potentially lead to such acts. In James' moral approach to the law, armed conflict, murder and adultery happen among his readers because they allow desire to entice them into minor offences<sup>(67)</sup>.

Department of Theology  
and Religious Studies  
Tilburg University  
P.O. Box 90153  
NL-5000 LE Tilburg

Huub VAN DE SANDT

<sup>(66)</sup> There are obvious agreements with the statements of principle (5,17-20) plus the so-called antitheses (5,21-48) in the Gospel of Matthew; see VAN DE SANDT – FLUSSER, *The Didache*, 193-237. Because a comparison between James and Matthew in this respect would exceed the scope of this contribution, this subject will be dealt with elsewhere.

<sup>(67)</sup> Other major points at which James exceeds the Two Ways imagery — and especially that of the *teknon* section — are the following. First, unlike the procedure in Did 3,1-6, mentioning each specific minor transgression and the major wrongdoing it gives birth to, James focuses on ἐπιθυμία as the ultimate vice responsible. For James it is “desire”, the internal, psychological temptation, that comes first. Second, James emphasizes the God-given ability of a transformed heart to discern and to carry out God's will. One cannot master the right road without God's help. The Torah is internalised by the gift of wisdom. As the “implanted word” (1,21), wisdom brings regeneration and rebirth. James distinguishes true and false wisdom, the one “from above” and the other “from the world” (3,13-18). Throughout the letter, and particularly in 4,1-6, he emphasizes God's role as the source of good things. The humble person is the one who trusts God and divine control of his life. It is not by way of sating one's own desires (τὸ ἐπιθυμεῖν), but by simply asking (τὸ αἰτεῖσθαι) that one can go about “having” or “obtaining” things (Jas 4,3). One must depend humbly, simply and wholly upon God.

### SUMMARY

The author of the Letter of James accuses his readers (Jas 4,1-4) of being responsible for war, murder and adultery. How are we to explain this charge? This paper shows that the material in Jas 1,13-21; 2,8-11 and 4,1-4 is closely akin to the *teknōn* section in Did 3,1-6. The *teknōn* section belonged to the Jewish Two Ways tradition which, for the most part, is covered by the first six chapters of the Didache. Interestingly, Did 3,1-6 exhibits close affinity with the ethical principles of a particular stream of Rabbinic tradition found in early *Derekh Erets* treatises. James 4,1-4 should be considered a further development of the warnings in Did 3,1-6.

## **Mehr Wurzel als Stamm und Krone. Zur Bildrede vom Ölbaum in Röm 11,16-24**

Die paulinischen Aussagen zu Israel in Röm 9–11 werden im christlich-jüdischen Dialog immer wieder herangezogen. Die damit einhergehenden fachexegetischen Bemühungen um diesen Spitzentext paulinischer Theologie hat zu einer kaum mehr überschaubaren Fülle von Beiträgen geführt. In vielen Fragen ist die Forschung von einem Konsens jedoch weit entfernt. Dies gilt insbesondere für die hermeneutisch meist hoch eingestufte Rede vom Ölbaum, die in ihrer Bildlichkeit eine Vielzahl von Lesarten zulässt. In der für die Verhältnisbestimmung von Kirche und Israel entscheidenden Passage des Konzilsdokuments *Nostra Aetate* Nr. 4 üben daher die Theologen des Zweiten Vatikanums eine auffallende Zurückhaltung bei der Deutung des Ölbaums:

Deshalb kann die Kirche auch nicht vergessen, daß sie durch jenes Volk, mit dem Gott aus unsagbarem Erbarmen den Alten Bund geschlossen hat, die Offenbarung des Alten Testaments empfangt und genährt wird von der Wurzel des guten Ölbaums, in den die Heiden als wilde Schößlinge eingepfropft sind. Denn die Kirche glaubt, daß Christus, unser Friede, Juden und Heiden durch das Kreuz und beide in sich vereinigt hat<sup>(1)</sup>.

Die Konzilsväter lassen damit offen, wer mit “der Wurzel des guten Ölbaums” und dem Ölbaum selbst gemeint ist. Bestimmter dagegen äußern sich die Exegeten. So stellt etwa H. Frankemölle fest, dass die “zahlreichen offiziellen und offiziellen Verlautbarungen aller Kirchen ... durch den Rückgriff auf Röm 9–11, wonach die Christen aus den Völkern als wilde Schößlinge in Israel als edlen Ölbaum eingepfropft wurden (vgl. Röm 11,16-24) ..., die schwierige hermeneutische Frage faktisch geklärt”<sup>(2)</sup> hätten. Mit seiner Festlegung des Ölbaums auf Israel folgt er der exegetischen Mehrheitsmeinung. Auch M. Theobald hält knapp und bestimmt fest: “Diese Mahnrede [sc. Röm 11,17-24] arbeitet mit festen Metaphern:

<sup>(1)</sup> Zitiert nach *LThK*, 2. Aufl., Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil. Kommentare, Teil II, 493.

<sup>(2)</sup> H. FRANKEMÖLLE, “Jüdisch-christlicher Dialog. Interreligiöse und innerchristliche Aspekte”, *Catholica* 46 (1992) 135.



Ölbaum = Israel (Jer 11,16; bMen 53b ...); Wurzel = Abraham (äthHen 93,8; TestJud 24,5); einpfropfen = Aufnahme von Proselyten in Israel<sup>(3)</sup>. In jüngster Zeit wird dem jedoch widersprochen. So präferieren M. Neubrand und J. Seidel eine Deutung des Ölbaums auf Christus<sup>(4)</sup> und N. Walter auf Gott<sup>(5)</sup>. Angesichts dieses offenen Diskurses ist es angebracht, die Metaphorik der Bildrede in ihrer Semantik und Intention erneut zu analysieren.

Nach meiner These erschließt sich das Metapherngefüge der Bildrede zunächst nicht über die Bestimmung von Person- oder Gruppenidentitäten (etwa Abraham, die Väter, Israel, Gott oder Christus), sondern allererst über die Bestimmung der ihnen zugrundeliegenden und sie konstituierenden Dynamik göttlichen Erwählens und Verheißens<sup>(6)</sup>. Die Personen und Gruppen, die als sekundäre Bedeutungsträger auszumachen sind, stehen in einem Verhältnis der Partizipation und Repräsentation zu der unverbrüchlichen Heilszusage Gottes. Eine christologische Konnotation lässt sich nicht aus der Bildebene, wohl aber aus dem Glaubensmotiv und dem größeren Kontext der Kapitel 10 und 11 ableiten.

## I. Zum Kontext

Die Bildrede vom Ölbaum ist Teil der Israel-Kapitel 9–11, in denen Paulus den Weg Israels durch die Zeiten in den Blick rückt. Das eigentliche Interesse gilt jedoch nicht Israel, sondern, wie schon zu Beginn der Ausführungen deutlich wird, der Frage nach der Verlässlichkeit des Wortes Gottes (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ 9,6), die angesichts einer mehrheitlichen Ablehnung des Evangeliums unter den Juden in Palästina und anderswo in Frage steht<sup>(7)</sup>. Wenn auf Gottes erwählendes Wort kein Verlass ist, steht auch die Glaubwürdigkeit des Evangeliums auf dem Spiel.

Die Stellung der Kapitel 9–11 im Ganzen des Römerbriefs ist nicht

<sup>(3)</sup> M. THEOBALD, *Der Römerbrief* (EdF 294; Darmstadt 2000) 77.

<sup>(4)</sup> M. NEUBRAND – J. SEIDEL, “‘Eingefropft in den edlen Ölbaum’ (Röm 11,24): Der Ölbaum ist *nicht* Israel”, *BN* 105 (2000) 61–76.

<sup>(5)</sup> N. WALTER, “Zur Interpretation von Römer 9–11”, *Praeparatio Evangelica*. Studien zur Umwelt, Exegese und Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments (Hrsg. W. KRAUS – F. WILK) (WUNT 98; Tübingen 1997) 212–233.

<sup>(6)</sup> Ich schließe damit v.a. an A. REICHERT, *Der Römerbrief als Gratwanderung*. Eine Untersuchung zur Abfassungsproblematik (FRLANT 194; Göttingen 2001) 203, an.

<sup>(7)</sup> Mit THEOBALD, *Römerbrief*, 260.

leicht zu erheben<sup>(8)</sup>. Das feierliche Ende von Röm 8 bringt die Darstellung des Heilsindikativs zu einem Abschluss, an den sich der paränetische Teil Röm 12–16 gut anschließt. Die den Passus 9–11 einleitende Klage des Paulus um Israel 9,1-5 irritiert hingegen, da ein gedanklicher Übergang nicht zu erkennen ist. Eine nähere Betrachtung zeigt aber, dass die Ausführungen in 9–11 durchaus an Früheres anschließen. So antizipiert die Rede von den λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, die den Juden anvertraut seien (3,2), die Liste der Vorzüge Israels, die Paulus in 9,4-5 ausführt. Auch 3,3 lässt mit dem Bedenken, ob der Treuebruch einiger Juden die Treue Gottes zunichte gemacht habe, die Thematik von 9–11 anklingen. Schließlich weist schon die *propositio* 1,16-17 als Überschrift für die anschließende Entfaltung des Evangeliums auf 9–11 voraus, da die Rede von der jedem Glaubenden zugewandten Retterkraft Gottes (δύναμις γάρ θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι 1,16b) nicht nur dem schon bekehrten Juden zugesagt ist, sondern auch auf die eschatologische Rettung ganz Israels (11,25-27) hin offen scheint<sup>(9)</sup>.

Zum Aufbau und der thematischen Struktur der Kapitel 9–11 ist Folgendes festzuhalten:

Die nach wie vor häufigste Strukturierung folgt der traditionellen Einteilung in die drei Kapitel 9, 10 und 11, wie sie die temporal-geschichtstheologische Perspektive nahe legt<sup>(10)</sup>. Danach nimmt Röm 9 die Vergangenheit Israels seit den Vätern in den Blick, Röm 10 die Begegnung Israels mit dem Evangelium in der Gegenwart und Röm 11 reflektiert auf Israels Ergehen in der Zukunft. Beachtung verdient, dass Paulus trotz einer dominant theologischen Diktion auch christologisch argumentiert. Während Röm 9 im Blick auf Israels vergangene Geschichte allein Gottes Handlungsträgerschaft ins Wort bringt, thematisiert Röm 10 die sich im Evangelium Christi offenbarende Gottesgerechtigkeit. Röm 11 rückt zwar wieder das Wirken Gottes in

<sup>(8)</sup> Vgl. W.S. CAMPBELL, "The Place of Romans ix-xi within the Structure and Thought of the Letter", *Studia Evangelica* VII (= TU 126) (Berlin 1982) 121-131; THEOBALD, *Römerbrief*, 261-263.

<sup>(9)</sup> Prononciert entfaltet von Theobald, "Der 'strittige Punkt' (Rhet. A. Her. I,26) im Diskurs des Römerbriefs. Die *propositio* 1,16f und das Mysterium der Errettung ganz Israels", "Nun steht aber diese Sache im Evangelium...". Zur Frage nach den Anfängen des christlichen Antijudaismus (Hrsg. R. KAMPLING) (Paderborn – München u.a. 1999) 183-228.

<sup>(10)</sup> Zu anderen Gliederungen vgl. THEOBALD, *Römerbrief*, 263-268; J.-N. ALETTI, *Israël et la loi dans la lettre aux Romains* (LeDiv 173; Paris 1998) 170-171.

den Vordergrund, zumindest über die Glaubensmotivik aber (11,20.23) und die schriftgelehrte Anspielung auf das Kommen des Parusiechristus (11,26) wird die Heilsmittlerschaft Christi unmissverständlich artikuliert.

Röm 11 ist noch etwas näher in den Blick zu nehmen. Eingeleitet wird dieses Kapitel von der Basisfrage, ob Gott sein Volk verstoßen habe, was sogleich mit einem μή γένοιτο energisch zurückgewiesen wird (11,1). Die Verse 1-10 stellen die gegenwärtige heilsgeschichtliche Situation in den Kontext der israelitischen Geschichte, die von Erwählung, Verstockung und Gnade bestimmt ist. Danach greift Paulus erneut die Frage nach dem Fall Israels auf, um sie wiederum mit einem knappen μή γένοιτο von sich zu weisen. Die folgende Gedankenreihe, von der die Bildrede vom Ölbaum nur einen Teil bildet, sucht dieses Verdikt weiter zu entfalten, ist aber nicht leicht zu verstehen. So wechselt Paulus ständig zwischen Aussagen, die auf das Geschick der Juden verweisen und solchen, die das Ergehen der Heiden im Blick haben<sup>(11)</sup>. Schon 11,12 wirkt merkwürdig verquer, da die Stoßrichtung der Argumentation eher auf das Heil der Heiden geht, statt wie zu erwarten wäre, auf das Israels<sup>(12)</sup>. Diese Tendenz wird durch die Verse 11,13-14 verstärkt. Anhebend mit einer direkten Ansprache an die Heidenchristen, „euch Heiden aber sage ich“ (11,13a), verifiziert Paulus die aus den vorangegangenen Schriftexegesen gewonnene Einsicht in Gottes Verheißungstreue in Hinsicht auf die Berufung der Heiden und die eschatologische Hoffnung für ganz Israel. Vor der Bildrede vom Ölbaum reflektiert der Apostel den geheimen Sinn von

<sup>(11)</sup> Die mangelnde Logik und die Brüche in der Gedankenführung hat besonders T. SCHMELLER, *Paulus und die „Diatriben“*. Eine vergleichende Stilinterpretation (NTA.NF 19; Münster 1987) 321-323, überzeugend herausgearbeitet. Zu den Widersprüchen zwischen 11,11-15 und dem Kontext siehe jüngst K. MÜLLER, „Von der Last kanonischer Erinnerungen. Das Dilemma des Paulus angesichts der Frage nach Israels Rettung in Röm 9–11“, *„Für alle Zeiten zur Erinnerung“* (Jos 4,7). Beiträge zu einer biblischen Gedächtniskultur (Hrsg. M. THEOBALD – R. HOPPE) (SBS 209; Stuttgart 2006) 225-232. Anders aber J. ADAM, „Kinder Gottes und Erben der Verheißung. Erwägungen zu Röm 11,16-24“, *Oleum laetitiae*. Festschrift B. Schwank (Hrsg. G. BRÜSKE – A. HAENDLER-KLÄSNER) (JThF 5; Münster 2003) 124-144, der in seiner Exegese die Aporien weithin glättet.

<sup>(12)</sup> Logisch wäre nach SCHMELLER, *Paulus*, 322, folgende Argumentation: „... wenn das gegenwärtige Heil der Heiden das Unheil Israels voraussetzt, dann wird auch ihr zukünftiges, erwartetes Heil an die Vermittlung durch Israel gebunden sein; insofern es ein gegenüber dem gegenwärtigen unvergleichbar gesteigertes Endheil sein wird, hat es das Heil Israels zur Voraussetzung“.

Israels gegenwärtiger Zurücksetzung durch Gott. Die jüdische Ablehnung des Evangeliums sieht Paulus unter der teleologischen Prämisse seiner Überzeugung, dass die Zurücksetzung Israels durch Gott nur eine vorübergehende Phase auf Israels Weg der Verheißung bedeute. Die Annahme des Evangeliums durch die Heiden, so die Hoffnung des Paulus, werde seine "Verwandten eifersüchtig machen und so einige von ihnen retten" (11,14). Der Folgevers 11,15 zeigt dieselbe Problematik wie 11,12, da er auf das Heil der Heiden als letzte conclusio und in eschatologischer Zuspitzung, die das Eifersuchtsmotiv im Grunde überflüssig macht, abhebt. Wenn schon die "Verwerfung" Israels der Welt "Versöhnung" bringt, was kann dann ihre "Annahme" durch Gott anderes sein als "Leben aus den Toten". Zu fragen ist, ob Paulus hier tatsächlich die eschatologische Totenerweckung in den Blick nimmt<sup>(13)</sup> oder in metaphorischer Redeweise "einen — wie auch immer gearteten — radikalen Umbruch vom Bösen zum Guten"<sup>(14)</sup> meint<sup>(15)</sup>. Wahrscheinlich wird man beides verbinden müssen. Dass in 11,12 der Reichtum der Heiden als endzeitlich-zukünftiges, von Israels "Vollzahl" inauguriertes Geschehen verstanden wird (vgl. auch das Futur in 11,23-24 und das Kommen des Parusie-Christus in 11,26), deutet auf einen dezidiert eschatologischen Charakter des "Lebens aus den Toten". Worauf es Paulus vor allen Dingen ankommt, ist der Gedanke, dass die Heiden gegenwärtig wie zukünftig nicht losgelöst vom Geschick Israels an Gottes Heil teilhaben<sup>(16)</sup>. In diesem Kontext steht nun auch die Rede vom Ölbaum.

Die zweigliedrige Aussage 11,16 leitet dazu über. Die wechselnde Blickrichtung der vorigen Verse macht die Deutung der beiden Metaphern nicht leicht<sup>(17)</sup>. Die erste spielt auf die Opferanweisung

<sup>(13)</sup> So die Mehrheit der Ausleger. Während aber A. SCHLATTER, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief (Stuttgart 1935) 323-324, an eine erste Auferstehung denkt, der eine zweite allgemeine folgen wird, lehnen neuere Kommentatoren eine konkret apokalyptische Bezugnahme ab; so zuletzt E. LOHSE, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KEK 4; Göttingen 2003) 313.

<sup>(14)</sup> K. HAACKER, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (ThHK 6; Leipzig 1999) 230.

<sup>(15)</sup> Zu weiteren Deutungen vgl. R.H. BELL, *The Irrevocable Call of God*. An Inquiry into Paul's Theology of Israel (WUNT 184; Tübingen 2005) 254-256.

<sup>(16)</sup> Vgl. U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKK VI; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1987) II, 245; D. ZELLER, *Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus*. Studien zum Römerbrief (FzB 8; Würzburg 1973) 243.

<sup>(17)</sup> Vgl. die ausführliche Diskussion von M.M. BOURKE, *A Study of the Metaphor of the Olive Tree in Romans XI* (SST Ser. 2, Nr. 3; Washington 1947) 66-78.

Num 15,20-21 an, wonach vom ersten Brotteig der Kornernte ein Teil Jahwe als Hebopfer dargebracht werden sollte. Offenkundig gibt Paulus der Teighebe damit den Sinn, als heiliger Teil den ganzen Teig heiligen zu können. Die Aussage, dass der Abhub den Rest heilige, ist dem AT indes an keiner Stelle zu entnehmen<sup>(18)</sup>. In Halla 3,1<sup>(19)</sup> findet sich vielmehr der Hinweis, dass sich jemand, der von einem festgekneteten Teig nehme, von dem die Teighebe noch nicht abgehoben ist, des Todes schuldig mache, da er von etwas esse, das Heiliges enthalte<sup>(20)</sup>. Daraus ist zu schließen, dass die Hebe nicht den Sinn hat, den Teig zu heiligen. Nur die Teighebe ist das Heilige und muss daher für das Opfer entfernt werden. Warum Paulus nun die Opferanweisung gegen den Strich kehrt, erhellt aus der nächsten Metapher, die aus der Heiligkeit einer Wurzel auf die der Zweige schließt. Dieses Modell einer physischen Übertragung von Heiligkeit, wie es übrigens auch in 1 Kor 7,12-16 vorkommt, ist offenbar der Grund für eine Umkehrung des atl. Opferverständnisses.

Das Bild von der Teighebe lässt, isoliert betrachtet, offen, ob es auf die Väter und Israel als das von ihnen geheiligte Gottesvolk<sup>(21)</sup> oder auf Israel in seinem Verhältnis zu den Heiden<sup>(22)</sup> zu beziehen ist. Die vorangehende Anrede der Heiden (11,13) spricht für Letzteres, die sich

<sup>(18)</sup> Vgl. M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Saint Paul. Épître aux Romains* (EtB; Paris 1950) 279; BOURKE, *Study*, 68; K. BERGER, "Abraham in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen", *MThZ* 17 (1966) 84; C.E.B. CRANFIELD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh 1979) II, 563.

<sup>(19)</sup> b.Hal 3,1 (hrsg. von L. GOLDSCHMIDT, Haag 1933, 308).

<sup>(20)</sup> Hinweis von M. HARTUNG, "Die kultische bzw. agrartechnisch-biologische Logik der Gleichnisse von der Teighebe und vom Ölbaum in Röm 11.16-24 und die sich daraus ergebenden theologischen Konsequenzen", *NTS* 45 (1999) 128-129.

<sup>(21)</sup> Vgl. BOURKE, *Study*, 75-76; WILCKENS, *Römer*, 246; W. KRAUS, *Das Volk Gottes. Zur Grundlegung der Ekklesiologie bei Paulus* (WUNT 85; Tübingen 1996) 314; SCHMELLER, *Paulus*, 296. – Kaum überzeugend ist ein von K.H. RENGSTORF, "Das Ölbaum-Gleichnis in Röm 11,16ff. Versuch einer weiterführenden Deutung", *Donum Gentilicium. New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube* (Hrsg. E. Bammel – C.K. Barrett – W.D. Davies) (Oxford 1978) 132-135, präferierter Bezug der Erstlingsgabe auf Adam zu begründen. Problematisch ist nicht nur der Bezug auf rabbinische Traditionen, sondern auch das Auseinanderdriften der beiden Metaphern. Vgl. die Kritik von HARTUNG, "Logik", 129, Anm. 9, an Rengstorfs Exegese von *Shab* 2,6.

<sup>(22)</sup> So F. SIEGERT, *Argumentation bei Paulus gezeigt an Röm 9-11* (WUNT 34; Tübingen 1985) 167, und HAACKER, *Römer*, 231, der dieses vom Kontext nahe gelegte Verständnis von Jer 2,3 (Israel als heilige Erstlingsfrucht des Herrn) untermauert sieht.

anschließende Pflanzenmetapher von der Wurzel, die die Zweige heiligt, jedoch eher für Ersteres. Da nämlich die Sachhälfte in beiden Metaphern sicher gleich bestimmt werden muss<sup>(23)</sup> und die Zweige der im Weiteren als Ölbaum spezifizierten Pflanze Israeliten sind, kann die Wurzel schwerlich für Israel stehen, da dies zu einer tautologischen Aussage führte<sup>(24)</sup>. Aus der Heiligkeit Israels auf die Heiligkeit der Israeliten zu schließen, macht keinen Sinn. Ob  $\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha$  aber die Erzväter bzw. näherhin Abraham versinnbildet, lässt sich erst durch Heranziehung der Ölbaumallegorie entscheiden.

## II. Die Bildrede vom wilden und edlen Ölbaum (Röm 11,17-24)

Obwohl die paulinische Rede vom wilden und edlen Ölbaum oft als "Ölbaum-Gleichnis"<sup>(25)</sup> bezeichnet wird, handelt es sich eher um ein allegorisches Bildfeld, das nicht eine literarische Gattung konstituiert, sondern für eine rhetorisch-poetische Verfahrensweise, die dem Text eine symbolische Dimension verleiht<sup>(26)</sup>. Da Bildrede und Deutung einander durchdringen, ist sie allerdings auch keine reine Allegorie.

In Ton und Zielsetzung zeigt die Bildrede einen deutlich paränetischen Charakter, wie schon aus der wiederholten Anrede in der 2. P. Sg., die die Anrede an die Heiden in 11,13 aufnimmt, deutlich wird. Die bleibende, selbst noch in der Verwerfung fortbestehende heilsgeschichtliche Bedeutung Israels lässt Paulus die Heidenchristen vor Überheblichkeit und falscher Heilsgewissheit warnen.

Bevor Paulus die Mahnung an die Heidenchristen, auf Israel nicht verächtlich herabzublicken, ausspricht, ruft er ihnen in Erinnerung, dass sie vom wilden Ölbaum stammen, an Stelle von herausgebrochenen Zweigen eingepropft wurden und so Anteil an der fettreichen Wurzel des Ölbaums bekamen. 11,17 spezifiziert Wurzel und Zweige der Pflanze von V. 16b als Wurzel und Zweige eines Fett spendenden, edlen Ölbaums. Die herausgebrochenen Zweige dieses

<sup>(23)</sup> Anders aber H. LIETZMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT 8; Tübingen 31933) 104, der die  $\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\chi\eta$  auf die Judenchristen und die  $\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha$  auf die Patriarchen beziehen möchte. So jüngst wieder BELL, *Call*, 274-277.

<sup>(24)</sup> Mit W. KELLER, *Gottes Treue – Israels Heil*. Röm 11,25-27. Die These vom "Sonderweg" in der Diskussion (SBB 40; Stuttgart 1998) 200.

<sup>(25)</sup> So im Titel des Aufsatzes von Rengstorf.

<sup>(26)</sup> Zur Allegorie vgl. H.-J. KLAUCK, *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten* (NTA NF 13; Münster 1978) 354.

Baums sind offensichtlich diejenigen Juden, die dem Evangelium keinen Glauben schenken und nun den Heiden Platz machen müssen. Der wilde Ölbaum (bzw. von der Bildlogik her dessen Gezweig) steht entsprechend für die Schar der Heiden, die Anteil an der göttlichen Bestimmung Israels erhält. Schwer deutbar ist hingegen die Wurzel des (edlen) Ölbaums. Die meisten Ausleger beziehen sie entweder auf Abraham oder allgemeiner auf die Patriarchen.

### 1. Die Wurzel des Ölbaums

Unter den diskutierten Deutungen am wenigsten haltbar ist ein Bezug der Wurzel zu den Judenchristen, da damit der für Paulus im Folgenden offenbar wichtige Unterschied zwischen der Wurzel und den Zweigen eingeebnet würde<sup>(27)</sup>. Schwierig ist auch der Ansatz von F. Mußner<sup>(28)</sup>, der Wurzel und Stamm des Baumes samt Zweigen als Einheit sieht<sup>(29)</sup> und auf Israel bezieht, woraus er ganz im Sinne seines dialogpragmatischen Interesses schließt, dass "die Kirche" in Israel verwurzelt sei. Auch hier werden Wurzel und Zweige "zusammengebunden", was Paulus' Intention zuwiderlaufen dürfte<sup>(30)</sup>.

Besser begründet scheint eine theologische Deutung, wie sie von mehreren Exegeten auch vertreten wird. So bezieht N. Walter den edlen Ölbaum, seine Wurzel und das aus ihr in die Zweige strömende Fett auf Gott, "auf sein Erwählen und Verheißen und die von ihm ausströmende Heilsgnade"<sup>(31)</sup>. Israel, aber auch die Heidenchristen, die an dem Wurzelfett Anteil bekommen, sind damit in die göttliche Heilsgeschichte "eingepflanzt". Damit wäre das heilsökonomische Verhältnis der Heiden zu Israel dezidiert theologisch fundamentiert. Die Heidenchristen erwarten ihre Rettung nicht von der Zugehörigkeit zu Israel, sondern von der Zugehörigkeit zum Gott Israels. W.

<sup>(27)</sup> So aber P. OSTEN-SACKEN, "Römer 9–11 als Schibboleth christlicher Theologie", *Evangelium und Tora*. Aufsätze zu Paulus (ThBib 77; München 1987) 303.

<sup>(28)</sup> F. MUßNER, "'Mitteilhaberin an der Wurzel'. Zur Ekklesiologie von Röm 11,11–24", *Die Kraft der Wurzel*. Judentum – Jesus – Kirche (Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1987) 153–154.

<sup>(29)</sup> Er stützt sich dabei auf J. BECKER, "Wurzel und Wurzelsproß. Ein Beitrag zur hebräischen Lexikographie", *BZ NF* 20 (1976) 44, nach dem "der Hebräer die 'Wurzel' prägnant als eine zum Hervorbringen des Schöbllings drängende Kraft" sehe, weshalb der Stamm bei der Wurzel mitgedacht sei.

<sup>(30)</sup> Vgl. P.-G. KLUMBIES, "Israels Vorzüge und das Evangelium von der Gottesgerechtigkeit in Röm 9–11", *WuD* 18 (1985) 151.

<sup>(31)</sup> WALTER, "Interpretation", 220.



Schmithals spezifiziert dies dahingehend, dass alle Bundes-schließungen auf den einzigen eschatologischen Bund Gottes, den universalen Bund von Juden und Heiden, zielten<sup>(32)</sup>. Paulus wolle Israel und die Heiden nicht in eine bestimmte heilsgeschichtliche Relation zueinander setzen, sondern dem Hochmut eines heidnischen Erwählungsprimats wehren.

Eine Schwäche dieser Deutung besteht allerdings darin, dass Gott hiernach zuerst als Wurzel firmierte, dann aber in 11,17-18 als logisches Subjekt des Herausbrechens und Einpfropfens begegnet<sup>(33)</sup>. So gestehen auch Walter und Schmithals die Interpretationsalternative zu, die Wurzel mit Abraham oder den Vätern verbinden zu können<sup>(34)</sup>. Dies ist kaum verwunderlich, da beide Lesarten, die theologische wie die abrahamitische, sachlich nahe beieinander liegen. Abraham und die Väter sind Empfänger und Vermittler von Gottes Zuwendung und Verheißung an Israel und die Völker. Die meisten Ausleger möchten das Bild von der Wurzel dennoch eindeutig auf die Väter oder auf Abraham bezogen wissen. Für eine Deutung auf die Patriarchen spricht 11,28b, wo es heißt, dass die Israeliten vom Evangelium her gesehen zwar Feinde seien, von ihrer Erwählung her jedoch "Geliebte, und das um der Väter willen"<sup>(35)</sup>.

Für Abraham lassen sich gleichfalls beachtliche Argumente anführen<sup>(36)</sup>. In TestJud 24,5 gilt er als die "Wurzel". Nach äthHen 93,5 ist der Erzvater erwählt als "die Pflanze des gerechten Gerichtes", Israel gilt als "das Geschlecht der auserwählten Wurzel" (93,8) und die Gerechten werden dereinst "von der ewigen Pflanze der Gerechtigkeit" (93,10) erwählt werden. Die rabbinische Haggada komponiert ein Gespräch Abrahams mit Gott unter Einbindung von Jeremias' Wort

<sup>(32)</sup> W. SCHMITHALS, *Der Römerbrief*. Ein Kommentar (Gütersloh 1988) 400.

<sup>(33)</sup> Mit REICHERT, *Römerbrief*, 203, Anm. 267.

<sup>(34)</sup> WALTER, "Interpretation", 220, Anm. 21; SCHMITHALS, *Römerbrief*, 400.

<sup>(35)</sup> Vertreter der Väterdeutung sind u.a. C. MAURER, "πίζα", *ThWNT* VI, 985-991, 989; H. SCHLIER, *Der Römerbrief* (HThK; Freiburg 1977) 332; WILCKENS, *Römer*, 246; D.J. MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1996) 698-701; J.C.T. HAVEMANN, "Cultivated olive – wild olive: the olive tree metaphor in Romans 11:16-24", *Neotest.* 31 (1997) 94-100; KELLER, *Treue*, 199-201; LOHSE, *Römer*, 313.

<sup>(36)</sup> Für einen Bezug auf Abraham plädieren u.a. BERGER, "Abraham", 84; J.D.G. DUNN, *Romans 9-16* (WBC 38B; Dallas 1988) 649-650; W. HOFIUS, "Das Evangelium und Israel. Erwägungen zu Röm 9-11", *Paulusstudien* (WUNT 51; Tübingen 1989) 186-187; KRAUS, *Volk*, 315-316; NEUBRAND – SEIDEL, "Ölbaum", 64-65.

11,15-16 über den üppigen Ölbaum Israel. Auf die flehentliche Bitte Abrahams, Gott möge seinen sündigen Kindern Gnade gewähren, ergeht eine Himmelsstimme, die spricht: "Ein grünender Ölbaum, fruchtschön von Gestalt' (Jer 11,16), so hat er dich genannt. [Das will besagen:] Wie bei einem [gewöhnlichen] Ölbaum, die [ihm bestimmte] Zukunft erst spät erreicht wird, so wird auch Israel die [ihm bestimmte Zukunft] erst spät erreichen"<sup>(37)</sup>. Auch wenn die genaue Bedeutung dieses ängstlichen Wortes nicht recht klar wird<sup>(38)</sup>, ist ihm doch zu entnehmen, dass sich nicht nur Israels Herkunft, sondern auch seine Zukunft nicht von Abraham trennen lässt. Seine "Zukunftsfähigkeit" unterstützt umgekehrt die Kraft seines Ölbaum- bzw. Wurzelseins. Wichtiger jedoch als das frühjüdische und rabbinische Abrahambild ist das paulinische selbst. Als προπάτωρ (Röm 4,1) nimmt Abraham eine Sonderstellung unter den Patriarchen ein. Dass Paulus Israelit ist und damit auch "aus dem Samen Abrahams" (Röm 11,1), gilt ihm als Beweis dafür, dass Gott sein Volk nicht verstoßen hat. In Röm 4 führt er mit Bezug auf Gen 15-17 den Nachweis, dass auch die unbeschnittenen Christusgläubigen in Abraham ihren Vater sehen und zu seiner Nachkommenschaft gerechnet werden dürfen<sup>(39)</sup>. Auch in Gal 3 wird Abraham als Ausgang von Verheißung und Segen vorgestellt. In ihm, dem Vorbild des Glaubenden, empfangen alle Völker den Segen Gottes und die Verheißung des Geistes.

Das Bild von der Wurzel, aus deren Fett sich sowohl die Zweige der Juden als auch die der Heiden nähren, ist mit diesen Aussagen gut in Übereinstimmung zu bringen. Die Fettigkeit der Ölbaumwurzel wäre der Glaube nach dem Vor- bzw. Urbild des Erzvaters<sup>(40)</sup>. Der Bezug der Wurzel allein auf Abraham ist aber dennoch keineswegs zwingend, da der letzte Verweis auf den Patriarchen in 11,1 gegeben ist und 11,28, wie bemerkt, alle Väter als Erwählungskonstituente in den Blick nimmt. In der Summe sollte daher die Wurzel nicht einseitig auf einen Bedeutungsträger, sei es Gott, Abraham oder die Väter allgemein, festgelegt werden. Wie leicht ersichtlich, lassen sich die

<sup>(37)</sup> Text und Deutung bei RENGSTORF, "Ölbaum-Gleichnis", 136-138.

<sup>(38)</sup> Nach RENGSTORF, "Ölbaum-Gleichnis", 137, Anm. 2, beruht das Wort wahrscheinlich "auf der Tatsache, dass der Ölbaum unverhältnismässig viel Zeit benötigt, um zur vollen Ertragsfähigkeit zu kommen. Es heisst, er brauche bis zur ersten Ernte zehn, bis zur Erreichung des Höchstertrags dreissig Jahre".

<sup>(39)</sup> Zu Abraham in Röm 4 vgl. M. NEUBRAND, *Abraham – Vater von Juden und Nichtjuden*. Eine exegetische Studie zu Röm 4 (FzB 85; Würzburg 1997).

<sup>(40)</sup> Vgl. SIEGERT, *Argumentation*, 168.

genannten Bezüge nämlich leicht verbinden. Die Wurzel ist dabei aber nicht direkt mit Gott zu identifizieren, sondern mit seinem Erwählen und Verheißen oder, wie es jüngst Angelika Reichert<sup>(41)</sup> vorschlägt, mit dem “nicht hingefallenen λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ”. Heilsgeschichtlich und personal wird dieser Logos göttlichen Planens und Handelns von Abraham bzw. den Vätern repräsentiert. Die Sequenz der Verse 9,5-7 vermag die Überschneidungen beider Deutungen gut zu dokumentieren. Die Israeliten sind hier charakterisiert durch die Verheißungen, die Väter, Abraham und eben den λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, der bleibend Bestand hat.

## 2. Der Ölbaum

Auch der Ölbaum als ganzer lässt sich in seinem Sinngehalt nicht leicht erschließen. Die Mehrheit der Forscher plädiert freilich für eine Identifizierung mit Israel oder dem Volk Gottes<sup>(42)</sup>. Hauptmovens dieser Auslegung ist die Prämisse, dass Paulus die Gleichsetzung Israels mit einem üppigen Ölbaum in Jer 11,16 übernommen habe. Es wird dabei jedoch meist übergangen, dass der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der Ölbaum-Metapher darauf nicht beschränkt werden kann. Betrachten wir diesen daher etwas genauer.

### a) Zur Symbolik des Ölbaums im AT

Der Ölbaum (hebr. תַּיִם) findet sich neben Jer 11,16 noch an weiteren atl. Stellen in übertragener Bedeutung<sup>(43)</sup>. Aber nur eine davon setzt den Ölbaum mit Israel in Beziehung. Hos 14,7 vergleicht Israels Pracht mit der eines Ölbaums. Hier wie dort steht die Rede vom Ölbaum Israel in einem Gerichtskontext<sup>(44)</sup>. Alle anderen Stellen rekurrieren auf menschliche Größen. Ps 128,3 etwa zeichnet die Söhne des frommen Israeliten als junge Ölbäume. In Ps 52,10 sieht sich der

<sup>(41)</sup> REICHERT, *Römerbrief*, 203.

<sup>(42)</sup> So u.a. D. ZELLER, *Der Brief an die Römer* (RNT; Regensburg 1985) 196-197; H. RÄISÄNEN, “Römer 9–11. Analyse eines geistigen Ringens”, *ANRW* II.25.4 (1987) 2914-2916; P. STUHLMACHER, *Der Brief an die Römer* (NTD 6; Göttingen 1989) 152; M. THEOBALD, *Römerbrief* (SKK.NT 6,1; Stuttgart 1993) I, 298-299; DERS., “Punkt”, 208-209; MOO, *Romans*, 702-703; KELLER, *Treue*, 197-202; HAACKER, *Römer*, 234-235; LOHSE, *Römer*, 314.

<sup>(43)</sup> Zum Folgenden vgl. NEUBRAND – SEIDEL, “Ölbaum”, 68-71; G.W. AHLSTRÖM, “תַּיִם *zajit*”, *ThWAT* II, 564-569, bes. 568.

<sup>(44)</sup> Vgl. W.D. DAVIES, “Romans 11:13-24. A Suggestion”, *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique. Mélanges offerts à Marcel SIMON* (ed. F.F. BRUCE et al.) (Paris 1978) 138.

Beter selbst als grünender Ölbaum im Haus Gottes. In Sir 24,12-14 sagt die Weisheit von sich:

Ich fasste Wurzel bei einem ruhmreichen Volk, im Eigentum des Herrn, in seinem Erbesitz. Wie eine Zeder auf dem Libanon wuchs ich empor, wie eine Zypresse<sup>(45)</sup> auf dem Hermongebirge. Wie eine Palme in En-Gedi wuchs ich empor, wie Oleandersträucher in Jericho, wie ein prächtiger Ölbaum in der Schefela, wie eine Platane am Wasser wuchs ich empor.

Auch der Hohepriester wird mit einem Ölbaum verglichen. Er ist, heißt es in Sir 50,10, "wie ein üppiger Ölbaum voll von Früchten, wie eine Zypresse mit saftigen Zweigen". Von daher wundert es nicht, dass auch die Wahl zum König in der Jotamfabel zuerst dem Ölbaum zugetragen wird (Ri 9,8-9). Aufschlussreich ist schließlich die fünfte Vision Sacharjas, in der die beiden Ölbäume, die der Seher schaut, als "die beiden Gesalbten" gedeutet werden, "die vor dem Herrn der ganzen Erde stehen" (4,14). In der Summe überwiegt also im AT die Beziehung des Ölbaums zu Personen, insbesondere zu solchen, welche vor Gott ihren Dienst tun oder ihn repräsentieren<sup>(46)</sup>. Eine Referenz zu Israel bleibt dagegen auf Jer 11,16 und Hos 14,7 beschränkt<sup>(47)</sup>.

#### b) Zum Für und Wider einer messianischen Deutung

Der statistische Befund im AT eröffnet nun die Option einer christologischen Interpretation des Ölbaums in Röm 11. Schon Myles M. Bourke dachte 1947 in einer kleinen Studie zur Ölbaummetapher in diese Richtung. Sein Anknüpfungspunkt ist die paulinische Konzeption vom mystischen Leib Christi, wie er sie in Gal 3,28-29; 1 Kor 12,12-13; Eph 2,11-17; 4,15-16; Kol 3,11 expliziert sieht<sup>(48)</sup>. Da die Eph- und Kol-Stellen jedoch deuteropaulinisch sind und Gal 3 nicht vom Leib Christi spricht, kann dieser kaum als Vergleichspunkt zu der Ölbaumallegorie gelten. Der Vergleich mit der Gal-Stelle liegt dennoch nahe. Auf die Betonung der Einheit und Gemeinschaft von

<sup>(45)</sup> Die EÜ übersetzt κυπάρισσος mit "wilder Ölbaum". Auch wenn  $\text{עֵץ זַיִן}$  in Jes 41,19; 1 Kön 6,31-33 und Neh 8,15 möglicherweise den wilden Ölbaum meint, macht das AT zwischen der Kultur- und der Wildform des Ölbaums keinen erkennbaren Unterschied (vgl. AHLSTRÖM, , "עץ זַיִן", 567).

<sup>(46)</sup> In Kontexten einer messianischen Zukunftshoffnung finden sich noch öfters Pflanzenmetaphern: vgl. Jes 11,1.10; Jer 33,15; Ez 17,22. Zu den Jes-Stellen später.

<sup>(47)</sup> Gegen O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KEK.NT 4; Göttingen <sup>12</sup>1963) 274, der Israel als Ölbaum für einen "verbreiteten Bildstoff" hält.

<sup>(48)</sup> BOURKE, *Study*, 40, 79-80.

Juden und Griechen in Christus, folgt nämlich die Aussage, dass alle die „in Christus“ auch Nachkommen Abrahams und Erben kraft der Verheißung sind (3,28-29). Im Bild des Ölbaums entspräche dies einer Deutung von Baum und Wurzel auf Christus und Abraham als Verheißungsempfänger. Hier wie dort entscheidet der Glaube über die Zugehörigkeit zu Abraham und Christus (vgl. auch Röm 4). Können die Heiden im Glauben zu Erben der Verheißungen werden, so können umgekehrt die Juden als Zweige des edlen Ölbaums der Verheißungen verlustig gehen, wenn sie denn im Unglauben verharren. Im Kontext der Paränese betont Röm 11 zwar deutlich das erwählungstheologische Primat der Israeliten, doch ist der Gleichheitsgedanke von Gal 3 auch im Ölbaumbild vom Glaubensmotiv her impliziert. Keine Abstammung, keine völkische Zugehörigkeit, sondern der Glaube bestimmt über die Zugehörigkeit zu Abraham, Christus und Gott. Bourke überschreitet allerdings deutlich die Textbasis der Paränese der Ölbaumallegorie, wenn er die Zugehörigkeit der Zweige zum Ölbaum mit Rekurs auf die Väterexegese als „incorporation into his [sc. Christi] Mystical Body, the Church“<sup>(49)</sup> verstehen will. Der Ölbaum ist ebensowenig mit der Kirche gleichzusetzen wie mit Israel.

Neubrand und Seidel, denen die Studie von Bourke nicht vorlag, aber ebenfalls in einem neueren Beitrag den Ölbaum auf Christus deuten, rekurrieren denn auch nicht auf die Idee vom Leib Christi, sondern allgemeiner auf die die paulinischen Hauptbriefe durchziehenden In-Christus-Aussagen: Röm 8,1; 12,5; 16,7; 1 Kor 1,30; 15,22; 16,24; 2 Kor 5,17; 12,2; Gal 1,22; 3,28; Phil 1,1<sup>(50)</sup>. Das Bild vom Ölbaum sei dann verständlich und in Übereinstimmung mit sonstigen Paulustexten, wenn man im Ölbaum einen Verweis auf den Messias Israels, auf Jesus Christus, sehe: „Jesus, Nachkomme Abrahams (Gal 3,16) [sic] ist der Messias Israels, er ist als solcher ἰδιὰ ἐλαίᾱ (Röm 11,24) des jüdischen Volkes, das κατὰ φύσιν zu ihm gehört“<sup>(51)</sup>. Das Zweigsein bzw. das Eingepfropftwerden entspricht im Bild dann den In-Christus-Aussagen.

Eine Stärke dieser Lesart sehen Neubrand und Seidel darin, dass auf der Bildebene zwischen Wurzel, Stamm und Zweigen klar unterschieden werden kann. Da sie die Wurzel auf die Gestalt Abrahams bezogen sehen, stellt sich ihnen Christus im Bild des Ölbaums als im Erzvater verwurzelter Heils- und Lebensmittler dar,

<sup>(49)</sup> BOURKE, *Study*, 111.

<sup>(50)</sup> Siehe NEUBRAND – SEIDEL, „Ölbaum“, 70-71.

<sup>(51)</sup> NEUBRAND – SEIDEL, „Ölbaum“, 70.

zuerst für die natürlich gewachsenen Zweige, die Juden, dann aber auch als Nährstätte für die eingepfropften Zweige des wilden Ölbaumes, die Heiden. Ein Schwachpunkt dieser Auslegung ist allerdings die Erklärungslücke hinsichtlich der für die paulinische Paränese zweifellos zentralen Prämisse 11,18b: “Nicht du trägst die Wurzel, sondern die Wurzel trägt dich!”. Denn wenn Christus der Ölbaum bzw. der Stamm wäre, müsste es dann nicht heißen: “Nicht du trägst den Ölbaum, sondern der Ölbaum trägt dich”? Der Hinweis auf die Wurzel scheint nämlich deutlich von dem Stamm bzw. dem Ölbaum wegzulenken und den Blick auf das “prächristologische” Fundament des status salus, Abraham oder die Väter, zu richten. An dieser Stelle ist die botanisch-phänomenologische Eigenart des Ölbaums näher in den Blick zu nehmen.

#### Exkurs: Die Argumentation des Paulus aus agrartechnischer Sicht

Verschiedene schriftliche Zeugnisse belegen, dass die phänomenologische Beschreibung des Ölbaums und seine gartenbautechnische Kultivierung schon in der Antike einen beachtlichen Stand erreicht hatten. Der “edle” und der “wilde” Ölbaum sind in ihrem Verhältnis morphologisch und genetisch nicht leicht zu bestimmen. Der Ölbaum gehört zur Familie der Oleaziden, genauer zur Gattung “*Olea*”<sup>(52)</sup>. In Europa kommt sie nur in einer von 35 bekannten Gattungen vor, der “*Olea europaea*” mit ihren Unterarten “*Olea europaea sativa*”, der Kulturform des europäischen Ölbaums, und “*Olea europaea sylvestris* (oleaster)”, der Wildform, kurz Oleaster genannt. Die paulinische Rede von der ἐλαία bezeichnet daher eindeutig die (etwa seit 3700 v.Chr. bekannte) *Olea europaea sativa*.

Morphologisch lassen sich beide Untergattungen wie folgt beschreiben. Der Oleaster bildet eine Buschform mit einem kleinen, immergrünen Blattwerk aus. Von der Kulturpflanze unterscheidet er sich durch seine vierkantigen, verdornten Äste und die kleinen, ungenießbaren Früchte. Da die Saatprodukte kultivierter Ölbäume

<sup>(52)</sup> Zum Folgenden vgl. HARTUNG, “Logik”, 131-139; A. MORETTINI, “Der Ölbaum”, *Tropische und subtropische Weltwirtschaftspflanzen*. Ihre Geschichte, Kultur und volkswirtschaftliche Bedeutung (Hrsg. W. BALLY) (Stuttgart 1962) II, 20-78; W. GRANDJOT, *Reiseführer durch das Pflanzenreich der Mittelmeerlande* (Schroeder Reiseführer; Bonn 1965) 12-17; T. STAUBLI, “Vom König, der lieber ein Bauer blieb. Archäobotanisches, Kulturgeschichtliches und Politisches zum wichtigsten Fruchtbaum Palästinas/Israels”, *Oleum laetitiae* (Hrsg. BRÜSKE – HAENDLER-KLÄSENER) 26-38.

Wildlinge ergeben<sup>(53)</sup>, unterscheidet die Botanik “primäre” und “sekundäre” Wildformen. Diese stammen vom Oleaster ab, jene vom kultivierten Baum. Schon Theophrast scheint zwischen beiden Wildformen unterschieden zu haben. Neben der Bezeichnung des wilden Ölbaums als κότινος begegnet bei ihm nämlich der Begriff ἄγριέλαιος für die Saatprodukte der Kulturbäume (*Historia plantarum* 1,14,4; 2,2,5).

Dass auch Paulus mit ἄγριέλαιος diese Bedeutung verbindet, ist allerdings nicht anzunehmen. Dies hätte nämlich die Aussage zur Folge, dass “die Heiden letztlich ebenfalls leibliche Nachkommen Abrahams wären, die sich nur als wilder Schößling in die falsche Richtung entwickelt hätten und die nun dank Gottes Gnade wieder in den edlen Ölbaum hineingelangt wären”<sup>(54)</sup>. Der ἄγριέλαιος des Paulus dürfte daher nur die primäre Wildform bezeichnen.

Dieser stellt Paulus in seiner Pflanzenallegorie den kultivierten, edlen Ölbaum entgegen. Die Abstammung der Kulturpflanze liegt weitgehend im Dunkeln<sup>(55)</sup>. Entsprechend groß ist die Zahl der Theorien über deren Ursprung und Inkulturnahme. Vermutlich stellt sie das Ergebnis eines über Jahrhunderte gesteuerten Selektionsprozesses dar. Während die Wildformen in mehreren Stämmen wachsen, kommt in der Kulturform in der Regel ein einziger Stamm zur Entwicklung<sup>(56)</sup>. In wärmeren Zonen kann der Baum eine beachtliche Höhe von 16-20 Metern erreichen. Das Spezifikum des Ölbaums ist jedoch nicht der Stamm, sondern sein komplexes, sowohl unter wie über der Erde wucherndes Wurzelwerk. Da der Ölbaum ständig neue Wurzeln und Triebe hervorbringt, die mit dem Wachstum des Stammes immer umfangreicher werden, bildet sich eine auffällige Verdickung des Stammfußes, die eine drei- bis vierfache Baumlänge und einen die Krone weit übertreffenden Umfang erreicht<sup>(57)</sup>. Kurz: Der Olivenbaum ist mehr Wurzel als Stamm und Krone. Dies dürfte erklären, warum Paulus trotz des ausladenden Bildfeldes nirgends den Stamm einbringt. Wenn er also den Ölbaum allein von Wurzel und

<sup>(53)</sup> Vgl. D. ZOHARY – P. SPIEGEL-ROY, “Beginnings of Fruit Growing in the Old World”, *Science* 187 (1975) 320 [nicht eingesehen].

<sup>(54)</sup> HARTUNG, “Logik”, 134.

<sup>(55)</sup> Zum Problem der Existenz und Art einer Stammpflanze vgl. die Diskussion von J. HOOPS, *Geschichte des Ölbaums* (SHAW.PH 1942/43, 3. Abh.; Heidelberg 1944) 17-23.

<sup>(56)</sup> Eine Ausnahme stellt der Ölbaum Südspaniens dar, der vorwiegend dreistämmig gezogen wird. Vgl. MORETTINI, “Ölbaum”, 28.

<sup>(57)</sup> Vgl. ebd., 29-30.



Zweigen bestimmt sein lässt, verliert die Frage, was der Ölbaum neben Wurzel und Zweigen darstelle, im Grunde ihren Sinn.

Für die Auslegung der Allegorese hat diese Baummorphologie erhebliche Konsequenzen. Ein exklusiv christologisches Verständnis des Ölbaums, wie von Bourke und Neubrand/Seidel präferiert, wäre aufgrund der Quasiidentität von Wurzel und Stamm nämlich nur dann möglich, wenn schon die Wurzel auf Christus bezogen würde. Dies unternimmt bereits Origenes<sup>(58)</sup> in seinem Römerbriefkommentar, was von der modernen Exegese nur wenig beachtet wird:

Diese Wurzel nennen die einen Abraham, die anderen Seth, andere irgendeinen der Väter, die in hohem Ansehen stehen. Ich aber kenne keine andere Wurzel, die heilig ist, und keine anderen heiligen Erstlingsgaben als nur unseren Herrn Jesus Christus. Er ist nämlich die ‚Erstlingsgabe‘ von allen, wie wir an der vorliegenden Stelle beim Apostel lesen. Das entspricht dem, was anderswo von ihm gesagt wird: ‚Er ist der Erstgeborene der ganzen Schöpfung‘ (Kol 1,15). Auf diese Wurzel wird jeder, der gerettet wird, aufgepfropft, und durch diese heilige Erstlingsgabe wird der ganze Teig des Menschengeschlechtes geheiligt<sup>(59)</sup>.

Origenes begründet seine Auslegung also von dem Begriff der ἀπαρχή in 11,16a her, die er durchaus zutreffend in Parallele mit der

(58) Neben Origenes ist noch Clemens von Alexandrien, *Strom* 6,2,4 zu nennen. Vgl. K.H. SCHEKLE, *Paulus. Lehrer der Völker. Die altkirchliche Auslegung von Römer 1–11* (KBANT 1; Düsseldorf 1956) 395.

(59) Und weiter führt er aus: „In Wahrheit gewährt die heilige Wurzel den Zweigen, die mit ihr verbunden bleiben, die Fruchtbarkeit, die in der Heiligkeit besteht, indem sie allen, die ihr anhängen, durch ihren Heiligen Geist das Leben schenkt, die durch ihr Wort hegt und pflegt, durch ihre Weisheit zum Blühen bringt und bewirkt, dass sie in der Fülle der Tugenden überreiche Frucht bringen. So kann sie selbst von ihnen sagen: ‚Ich aber bin im Hause Gottes wie ein fruchtbarer Ölbaum‘ (Ps 52,10: LXX Ps 51,10). Wenn nämlich die Zweige, die herausgebrochen wurden, wegen ihres Unglaubens herausgebrochen wurden, und die Zweige, die Bestand haben, im Glauben Bestand haben, wer anders kann es sein, in dem sie Bestand haben, als Jesus Christus? Und wer ist es anders, aus dem sie durch ihren Unglauben herausgebrochen wurden, wenn nicht der, dem sie nicht geglaubt haben? Immer also wurden alle, die zum Glauben hinzukamen beziehungsweise die das Bürgerrecht in Israel gewannen, in Christus, der das wahre Israel war, eingepfropft. Vor allem seit seiner Ankunft jedoch werden viele Zweige vom wilden Ölbaum auf diese Wurzel aufgepfropft oder auch in seine Zweige, die Apostel und Propheten Gottes, eingepfropft, so dass alle, die mit ihnen verbunden sind, Anteil gewinnen an der Wurzel und an der Fruchtbarkeit Christi“ (*Comm. in ep. ad Romanos* 8,11, Übers. nach T. HEITHER, *Römerbriefkommentar. Siebtes und achttes Buch* [FC 2,4; Freiburg u.a. 1994] 293–294).

ρίζα von 11,16b sieht. Es verwundert allerdings, dass er zur Unterstützung seiner christologischen Deutung der Erstlingsgabe nur auf Kol 1,15 und nicht auf die Parallele 1 Kor 15,20 abhebt. Dort nämlich wird Christus als “Erstling der Entschlafenen” vorgestellt und damit einer eschatologischen Erwartung zugeordnet, wie sie der Apostel auch in Röm 11,15 aufruft. Auch von der modernen Exegese wird dieser Bezug zu 1 Kor 15 meist übergangen<sup>(60)</sup>. K. Barth, der prominenteste Befürworter einer christologischen Deutung der Wurzel in neuerer Zeit, argumentiert in seiner Kirchlichen Dogmatik anders: “Die Wurzel ... kann *primär* doch nur das meinen, was Israel in allen seinen Gliedern zu Israel macht, worin es in allen seinen Gliedern das erwählte Volk Gottes ist und bleibt. Das ist aber die dem Abraham gegebene Verheißung eines Samens, durch den alle Völker gesegnet werden sollen und die Erfüllung dieser Verheißung”<sup>(61)</sup>. Auffallend ist, dass diese Auslegung im Grunde nicht weit von den anderen bisher erwogenen Lesarten entfernt ist, da sie gleichfalls auf die Erwählung und Verheißung Gottes sowie auf den Erzvater Abraham anspielt, nur dass sie nicht dessen Glauben, sondern dessen messianischen Nachkommen in den Blick rückt. Barth sieht diesen Bezug der Wurzel auf Christus insbesondere von dem Heilswort Jes 11,10 von der “Wurzel Isais” unterstützt: “An jenem Tag wird es die Wurzel (שֹׁרֶשׁ) Isais sein, die dasteht als Zeichen für die Nationen; die Völker suchen ihn auf; sein Wohnsitz ist prächtig”. Dieses Heilswort ist in der Tat bemerkenswert, da die angekündigte Herrschergestalt nicht mit einem “Trieb aus der Wurzel” wie zu Beginn des Kapitels 11,1 (יִצְחָק מִשְׁרֵשׁ), sondern mit der Wurzel selbst identifiziert wird. Die LXX verstärkt diese Sicht noch, indem sie in 11,1 nicht nur שֹׁרֶשׁ, sondern auch עֵנָב, den Stamm, mit ρίζα überträgt: καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ρίζης Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἄνθος ἐκ τῆς ρίζης ἀναβήσεται (11,1).

LXX-Jes belegt damit ein “messianisches” und die Völker umgreifendes Verständnis der Wurzelmetapher, die mit der Morphologie des Ölbaums mit ihrer Einheit von Wurzel und Stamm gut übereinstimmt. Umso mehr Beachtung verdient, dass Paulus in Röm 15,12 die Jes-Stelle sogar zitiert: ἔσται ἡ ρίζα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν ...

A.T. Hanson, der Barths Auslegung aufgreift, zieht noch weiteres

<sup>(60)</sup> Vgl. jüngst aber D. STARNITZKE, *Die Struktur paulinischen Denkens im Römerbrief*. Eine linguistisch-logische Untersuchung (BWANT 163; Stuttgart 2004) 353, und ablehnend BELL, *Call*, 275.

<sup>(61)</sup> K. BARTH, *Die kirchliche Dogmatik* (Zürich 41959) II, 314.

Material heran, so die Stelle Jes 53,2 aus dem vierten Gottesknechtslied: “Vor seinen Augen wuchs er auf wie ein junger Spross (רִנָּה), wie eine Wurzel (שֹׁרֶשׁ) aus trockenem Boden”<sup>(62)</sup>. Die LXX macht aus dieser Aussage eine Verkündigungsformel, die an andere bekannte Prophezeiungen eines davidischen Heilsbringers erinnern: ἀνγγείλαμεν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον ὡς ῥίζα ἐν γῇ διψώσῃ<sup>(63)</sup>. Mit Ziegler u.a. ist hier nämlich statt des unverständlichen ἀνγγείλαμεν ein ἀνέτειλε μὲν zu konjizieren, das angesichts der Vorliebe von LXX-Jes für das Verb ἀνατέλλειν gut begründet ist<sup>(64)</sup>. Der sich damit ergebende Wortlaut ἀνέτειλε μὲν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον ὡς ῥίζα ἐν γῇ διψώσῃ erinnert an Jes 11,1, aber auch an das “messianische” Kind Jes 7,16; 9,5 und an das eschatologische Aufgehen der Doxa des Kyrios: ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέταλκεν (Jes 60,1)<sup>(65)</sup>. Hanson hält es daher für gut möglich, dass Paulus mit der Wurzelmetapher ebendiese “messianischen” Konnotationen verbunden hat, die in ihr Christus als Davididen und Gottesknecht versinnbildet sehen<sup>(66)</sup>.

<sup>(62)</sup> A.T. HANSON, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (London 1974) 119.

<sup>(63)</sup> Ablehnend F. HAHN, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum (Göttingen 1995) 154, Anm. 1.

<sup>(64)</sup> Vgl. J. ZIEGLER, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaia*s (ATA 12,3; Münster 1934) 99; M. HENGEL, “Zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Jes 53 in vorchristlicher Zeit”, *Der leidende Gottesknecht. Jesaja und seine Wirkungsgeschichte* (Hrsg. B. JANOWSKI – P. STUHLMACHER) (FAT 14; Tübingen 1996) 83-84. Anders F. SIEGERT, “Die Septuaginta-Übersetzung und die Sprache der Theologie”, *Religionsgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*. Festschrift K. Berger (Hrsg. A. v. DOBBELER – K. ERLEMANN – R. HEILIGENTHAL) (Tübingen – Basel 2000) 320, 322.

<sup>(65)</sup> Vgl. E.R. EKBLAD, *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint*. An Exegetical and Theological Study (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 23; Leuven 1999) 201-205; HENGEL, *Wirkungsgeschichte*, 84; G. BERTRAM, “Praeparatio evangelica in der Septuaginta”, *VT* 7 (1957) 237-238.; W. ZIMMERLI, “παῖς θεοῦ”, *ThWNT* V, 675-676.

<sup>(66)</sup> Einen weiteren christologischen Bezug verbindet HANSON, *Studies*, 121-122, mit Jer 11,19, einem gegen den Propheten gerichteten Drohwort, das diesen als Schlachtlamm und Baum, der in seinem Saft verdorben werden sollte, vorstellt: “Paul would read this as an utterance of the pre-existent Christ, prophesying his death and vindication”. – Auf die Tradition vom leidenden Gerechten rekurriert auch P.J. MAARTENS, “Inference and Relevance in Paul's Allegory of the Wild Olive Tree”, *HTS* 53 (1997) 1017: “The root as vehicle of a submerged metaphor refers to the beginnings of Israel. In Romans 9:3-5 this reference goes back to the calling of the patriarchs, the covenant privileges and promises. The tenor of the vehicle may very likely include reference to the

Was nun aber dennoch eindeutig gegen die Gleichsetzung der Wurzel mit Christus spricht, ist der ausführliche Rekurs des Paulus auf die israelitische Erwählungsgeschichte, die mit 11,28 in der Anbindung des Heilsstandes an die Väter gipfelt<sup>(67)</sup>. Für die Akzentsetzung der paulinischen Argumentation ist die Aussage 11,28 sehr aufschlussreich, da sie das Evangelium und die Erwählung in ihrer soteriologischen Bedeutung einander gegenüberstellt: “Nach dem Evangelium sind sie [die Israeliten] Feinde wegen euch, nach der Erwählung aber Geliebte wegen der Väter. Denn unwiderruflich sind die Gnaden und die Berufung Gottes” (11,28-29). Wenn Teile Israels also dem Evangelium Christi gegenüber feindlich und ungehorsam (vgl. 11,30-32) gesinnt sind, dann kann die Wurzel des edlen Ölbaums, dem die Israeliten κατὰ φύσιν angehören, nicht Christus meinen, sondern nur, wie oben gezeigt, das von Abraham bzw. den Vätern repräsentierte Wort Gottes, das erwählt und verheißt. Da die Wurzel, wie auch von der Pflanzenmorphologie bestätigt, die für die Sachaussage und Paränese entscheidende Bezugsgröße darstellt, wird somit in summa deutlich, dass die christologische Perspektive in den Metaphern Wurzel und Stamm keinen Anhalt hat<sup>(68)</sup>. Der jüngste Versuch von Neubrand und Seidel, im Ölbaum Jesus Christus, den Messias Israels, zu sehen, kann also nicht für sich einnehmen.

Folgt nun daraus die Identität des Ölbaums mit Israel? N. Walter verneint dies, da Israel doch durch die Bezweigung repräsentiert werde und daher nicht auch mit dem Baum identisch sein könne. Dies dürfte jedoch zu spitzfindig sein und ist von der Exegese daher zu Recht nicht rezipiert worden. Die schlichte Gleichsetzung des Baumes mit Israel greift freilich dennoch zu kurz. In der Konsequenz des Bildes ist nämlich der Baum von der Wurzel her zu bestimmen. Die Semantik

---

suffering righteous one, with contextual support in Romans 15:1-6 and 1Cor 16:15. In fact the suffering righteous one is the embodiment of the covenant with Israel”. Diese Implikation des leidenden Gerechten und ihr Bezug auf den “resurrected Lord” (1018) möchte Maartens aber nur als einen “tenor” unter anderen verstehen. Die aufgeführten Parallelen dürften eine eindeutige Referenz auch kaum zulassen.

<sup>(67)</sup> Vgl. KELLER, *Treue*, 201.

<sup>(68)</sup> Vgl. auch die Kritik von H. FRANKEMÖLLE, “Die paulinische Theologie im Kontext der heiligen Schriften Israels. ‘So viele Verheißungen Gottes, in ihm das Ja’ (2 Kor 1,20)”, *Studien zum jüdischen Kontext neutestamentlicher Theologien* (SBA B 37; Stuttgart 2005) 230, Anm. 54, der “sowohl entsprechende Leserlenkungen im Text selbst als auch Voraussetzungen auf Seiten der Leser in Rom für eine solche [sc. christologische] Rezeption” vermisst.

der Wurzel überträgt sich auf die Deutung des aus ihr herauswachsenden Ölbaums. Auch er steht für das Erwählen und Verheißen Gottes, nur diesmal getragen und verkörpert von Israel. Der Ölbaum ist die Gesamtheit derjenigen, die unter dem erwählenden Handeln Gottes und seiner Verheißung stehen und sie im Glauben annehmen. Dieser Glaube, der zwar nicht im Bild, wohl aber auf kommentierender Ebene ins Wort gebracht wird, ist näherhin als Christusglaube zu spezifizieren.

### 3. *Christologische Implikationen*

Für die Einordnung des Glaubensmotivs, das in den V. 20 und 23 verbalisiert wird, ist der Kontext der Bildrede zu beachten. Die Glaubenthematik ist nämlich offenkundig rückgebunden an den Abschnitt 10,6-15, der die soteriologische Relevanz des Glaubens an Christus herausstellt. So heißt es in 10,9: “Denn wenn du mit deinem Mund bekenntest, dass Jesus der Herr ist, und in deinem Herzen glaubst, dass ihn Gott von den Toten erweckt hat, so wirst du gerettet werden”. Durch diesen Kernsatz wie überhaupt das ganze Kap. 10 ist Röm 9–11 an die allgemeine Erörterung der Rechtfertigung allein aus Glauben von Röm 3–4 angebunden. Jüngst hat M. Theobald die πίστις als den “strittigen Punkt” im Diskurs des Römerbriefs herausgestellt<sup>(69)</sup>. Für Israel bedeutet der Glaube an die Rettermacht Jesu Anstoß und Ärgernis (vgl. 9,32), weswegen es ihn mehrheitlich ablehnt. So hängen auch Wachstum und Früchte des Ölbaums am Glauben: “Ganz recht! Sie [die Juden als die Zweige des edlen Ölbaums] sind ihres Unglaubens willen herausgebrochen worden” (11,20). Umgekehrt werden sie, “wenn sie nicht im Unglauben bleiben, (wieder) eingepfropft werden” (11,23). Richtmaß des Heiles ist also auf der Bildebene die Bindung an den Wurzelstamm des Ölbaums. Auf der Sachebene jedoch wird dies dahingehend präzisiert, dass die von Gott in der Nachkommenschaft der Väter gegebenen Verheißungen nur im Glauben an den Messias Jesus, an sein Wort (10,17) und seine Auferweckung durch Gott (10,9), eingelöst werden. Dem von Neubrand und Seidel formulierten Monitum, dass die Vorstellung einer Rettung der Nichtjuden “an Christus vorbei” im Widerspruch zur sonstigen paulinischen Theologie stünde<sup>(70)</sup>, ist mit dem Hinweis auf

<sup>(69)</sup> THEOBALD, “Punkt”, bes. 200-203, 208-217.

<sup>(70)</sup> NEUBRAND – SEIDEL, “Ölbaum”, 66.

die grundlegende Relevanz des Glaubens vollauf Gentige getan, ohne indes Christus in die Bildebene einschreiben zu müssen.

Die Heilsbedeutung des Christusglaubens scheint von Paulus freilich insofern entgrenzt zu werden, als er im Anschluss an die Ölbaumallegorie 11,25-27 die Rettung "ganz Israels" der Endzeit vorbehält, in der "der Retter aus Zion kommen wird, der abwenden wird alle Gottlosigkeit von Jakob" (ἤξει ἐκ Σιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος, ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ 11,26). Da es sich um ein Schriftzitat aus LXX-Jes 59,20 handelt und dort mit ὁ ῥυόμενος Gott gemeint ist, ist prima facie nicht klar, ob Paulus die Parusie theologisch oder christologisch verstanden wissen möchte<sup>(71)</sup>. Exegeten, die hinter dem ῥυόμενος Gott vermuten, berufen sich auf die durchgehend theologische Diktion von Röm 11. Dies wird von der Bildrede des Ölbaums gestützt, wo es in 11,23b heißt, dass es in Gottes Macht steht, die zuvor ungläubig gewordenen und daher herausgebrochenen Zweige der Juden wieder einzupfropfen. Auch die Aussage 11,20: "wegen ihres Unglaubens wurden sie ausgebrochen, du aber stehst aufgrund des Glaubens" kann das Primat göttlicher Bestimmung und Handelns nicht aufheben<sup>(72)</sup>. Es ist nämlich zu beachten, dass die negative Feststellung fehlenden Glaubens in der prophetischen Matrix einer von Gott selbst verhängten und wieder gelösten Verstockung zu situieren ist. Nach der Mysteriumsverkündigung 11,25-27 wird diese Verstockung, die auf einem Teil Israels liegt, aber erst im Eschaton aufgehoben. Dass der kommende Retter Gott ist, lässt sich im Hinblick auf sonstige paulinische Parusieaussagen dennoch nicht verifizieren. In 1Thess 1,10 wird nämlich eindeutig Jesus als kommender ῥυόμενος vorgestellt, und in Röm 7,24-25 kommt die Rettung zwar von Gott, bewirkt wird sie aber durch Jesus Christus. Nicht zuletzt in Röm 10 und 11 markiert Christus die stets präsente Richtungsscheide, so dass es nicht vermittelt wäre, wenn Paulus letztendlich einen Sonderweg der Rettung, nicht nur an der Kirche, sondern auch an Christus vorbei, verkünden wollte<sup>(73)</sup>. R.H. Bell<sup>(74)</sup> nennt neben der Parallele 1Thess 1,10 drei weitere

<sup>(71)</sup> Eine extensive Auseinandersetzung mit dem Forschungsdiskurs bietet KELLER, *Treue*, 271-277.

<sup>(72)</sup> Eine ausführliche Begründung liefert THEOBALD, "Punkt", 211-217.

<sup>(73)</sup> So aber erwogen von M. RESE, "Die Rettung der Juden nach Römer 11", *L'Apôtre Paul. Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministère* (éd. A. VANHOYE) (BETHL 73; Leuven 1986) 430.

<sup>(74)</sup> R.H. BELL, *Provoked to Jealousy. The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9-11* (WUNT 2,63; Tübingen 1994) 142-143.

Gründe einer Deutung des Retters auf Christus: Die Wendung ἐκ Σιών sei schwieriger zu verstehen, wenn sie auf Gott, statt auf Christus bezogen werde. Weiter weise der Personenwechsel ἤξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ῥυόμενος zu der 1. Person in 11,27 auf eine von Gott unterschiedene Rettergestalt. Schließlich finde sich auch in rabbinischer Tradition eine messianische Deutung von Jes 59,20<sup>(75)</sup>. An einem Bezug zum Parusiechristus kann in summa also kein Zweifel bestehen<sup>(76)</sup>.

Im Ganzen der Kapitel 10 und 11 kommt der christologischen Perspektive also eine wichtige Rolle zu. Die Israelidentität des Ölbaums darf daher nicht allein von der Bildebene her bestimmt werden, sondern hat die Determinante des Christusglaubens einzubeziehen. Nur der kann Zweig des Ölbaums sein, der sich zu dem Evangelium Christi bekennt. Die theologische Perspektive ist im Ganzen dennoch dominierend.

#### 4. Theologische Implikationen

Sowohl der Christusglaube als auch das Parusiegeschehen im Eschaton stehen in einer theologischen Matrix, deren Basis die unverbrüchliche Verheißungszusage Gottes bildet. Folgerichtig endet denn auch die Israel-Trilogie der Kapitel 9–11 in einem Lobpreis Gottes (11,33-36). Der kommende Retter, der allen Frevel von Jakob entfernen wird (11,26), ist zwar Christus, doch ist es Gott, der Erbarmen gewährt und die Sünden fortnimmt. Das Begründungs- und Handlungsprimat Gottes im Heilswerk der Sündenvergebung bestätigt auch 3,23-25<sup>(77)</sup>. Die Erlösung geschieht "in Christus Jesus", doch ist dieser von Gott zur Sühne "hingestellt", auf dass seine Gerechtigkeit erwiesen werde. In der Ölbaumrede kommt diese Handlungspriorität in den passiva divina zum Ausdruck, die Gottes Heils- und Gerichtshandeln als ein Herausbrechen und Wiedereinpflanzen beschreiben. In ihrer theologischen Aussage sind diese Bildelemente zwar eindeutig, nicht jedoch, was ihre agrartechnische Logik angeht. Umstritten ist nämlich, ob Paulus hier auf eine geläufige Zuchtpraxis rekurriert.

Über den Pfropfvorgang gibt es in der antiken Fachliteratur

<sup>(75)</sup> Mit Hinweis auf b.Sanh. 98a.

<sup>(76)</sup> Anders aber ZELLER, *Römer*, 199; MÜLLER, "Last", 238-240, die trotz der Futura das Kommen als Hinweis auf das längst zurückliegende "erste Gekommen-Sein Jesu" beziehen. Kritisch F. MUSSNER, "'Leben aus Toten' (Röm 11,15)", *TThZ* 112 (2003) 79.

<sup>(77)</sup> Anders akzentuiert KELLER, *Treue*, 273.



bemerkenswert detaillierte Darlegungen. Nach Theophrast gedeiht der Pfropfling am besten auf dem Wurzelwerk eines wilden Baumes, weil dieser als besonders nahrhaft und weniger krankheitsanfällig galt (*De causis plantarum* 1,6,10; *Historia plantarum* 4,14,1-2)<sup>(78)</sup>. Er empfiehlt daher, zuerst Wildbäume zu pflanzen und ihnen Zweige eines edlen Baumes einzupfropfen, da sie an eine starke Unterlage, wie sie der Oleaster bildet, besser anbinden. Auch bei Theophrasts Zeitgenosse Columella ist zu lesen, dass Bäume mit einer wilden Wurzel und edlen Zweigen am fruchtbarsten seien (*De re rustica* 5,10,6). Doch ist auch eine umgekehrte Praxis der Kultivierung belegt, eben die, welche Paulus ins Bild bringt. So bezeugt Columella den Brauch, auf edle Bäume wilde Zweige aufzupfropfen. Als erster hat W.M. Ramsey (vor nun 100 Jahren) auf diese Parallele zu Paulus hingewiesen<sup>(79)</sup>. Die Sitte, Wildlinge auf einen Kulturbaum aufzupfropfen, sei nicht nur möglich und erfolgreich, sondern auch verbreitet gewesen. Dies bezeugen der Botaniker T. Fischer<sup>(80)</sup> für Palästina und R. von Seidenstam<sup>(81)</sup> für Griechenland. Seidenstam weiß allerdings nur von dem Aufpfropfen von Wildlingen auf unterirdische, erst freizulegende Wurzeln. Gleich aber, ob auf die unterirdische Wurzel oder den Stamm als ihren obersten Fortsatz aufgepfropft wird: entscheidend ist die Stärke und Kraft eines Baumes, die nicht nur von der Wildform, sondern auch von dem Alter bestimmt wird. Bei den Zweigen dagegen scheint man der Auffassung gewesen zu sein, dass solche des wilden Baumes kräftiger als die des edlen sind. Das Pfropfen mit wilden und mit edlen Zweigen dürfte also gleichermaßen gängig gewesen sein. Dies deutet darauf hin, dass letztlich weniger die Art der Pfropflinge als die Art der Wurzel für den Erfolg des Einpfropfens entscheidend ist<sup>(82)</sup>. Dies stimmt mit dem Ölbaumbild des Paulus überein, da auch hier die Lebenskraft der Wurzel die die Fruchtbarkeit bestimmende Größe bildet. Von daher dürfte die vieltraktierte Frage, ob und auf

<sup>(78)</sup> Vgl. P.F. ESLER, *Conflict and Identity in Romans*. The Social Setting of Paul's Letter (Minneapolis 2003) 301-304; HARTUNG, "Logik", 136-139.

<sup>(79)</sup> W.M. RAMSEY, "The Olive Tree and the Wild Olive", *Exp.* 11 (1905) 16-34.152-160; in jüngerer Zeit rezipiert von A.G. BAXTER – J.A. ZIEGLER, "Paul and Abiculture: Romans 11.1", *JSNT* 24 (1985) 25-32.

<sup>(80)</sup> T. FISCHER, *Der Ölbaum*. Seine geographische Verbreitung, seine wirtschaftliche und kulturhistorische Bedeutung. Eine Studie (Gotha 1904) 9.

<sup>(81)</sup> Vgl. D.S. LINDER, "Das Pfropfen mit wilden Ölzweigen (Röm. 11,17)", *PJ* 26 (1930) 41-42.

<sup>(82)</sup> Vgl. die Überlegungen von O. KUSS, *Der Römerbrief*. Dritte Lieferung (Röm 8,19 bis 11,36) (Regensburg 1978) 808.

welches Verfahren Paulus Bezug nimmt, von keiner größeren Bedeutung sein. Insbesondere liegt auf der Bildebene keine Paradoxie vor, wie gern angenommen wird<sup>(83)</sup>.

Der agrartechnisch orientierte Diskurs wird zudem von einem jüdischen Traditionsbezug relativiert, der das Bild von eingepfropften Zweigen auf die Gewinnung von Proselyten bezieht<sup>(84)</sup>. Philo etwa stellt einem jeden Gottessucher unter den Heiden in Aussicht, "dass Gott die Tugend, die aus unedler Abstammung erwächst, willkommen heißt, während er auf die Wurzeln zwar verzichtet, den kräftigen Schößling aber annimmt, weil er sich in einen edlen verwandelt hat, der gute Früchte bringt" (Praem., 152). Möglicherweise ist dieses Motiv der Hauptgrund, warum Paulus das Bild vom Ölbaum einbringt.

Was ist nun weiter mit der Unterscheidung von "natürlich" und "widernatürlich" (von κατὰ φύσιν und παρὰ φύσιν) gemeint, mit der die Allegorie in 11,24 schließt? Sowohl die Zweige des edlen wie die des wilden Baumes sind je für sich κατὰ φύσιν (11,21; 11,24ac). Die wilden Zweige können daher dem edlen Ölbaum nur παρὰ φύσιν eingepfropft werden. Paulus nennt aber nirgends die Zweige selbst παρὰ φύσιν, sondern nur den Vorgang des göttlichen Einpfropfens. Damit ist eindeutig ein theologischer Akzent gesetzt. Den Heiden wird eindringlich vorgehalten, dass ihre Rettung allein Gott verdankt ist. Sein Machthandeln bleibt jeder menschlichen Wahrnehmung und Bestimmung entzogen.

Der Schlusssatz 11,24 macht nochmals die eigentümliche Dialektik der in Röm 11 entwickelten Universaloteriologie gut deutlich<sup>(85)</sup>. Auch wenn Israel "gefallen" ist (11,11), führt dies im Ganzen der göttlichen Heilsplanung, unter der eben auch die Verstockung aufgehoben ist, zu einer Rettung der Heiden, die ihrerseits das Heil der Juden nach sich zieht. Das argumentum a maiori ad minus setzt voraus, dass das Heil der Heiden nicht ohne das der Juden zu haben ist.

Auch in der direkt an die Heiden gerichteten Bildrede ist es Paulus also um die Rettung von beiden Gruppen zu tun. Heiden wie Juden sollen an der Lebenskraft des Ölbaums Anteil haben und erhalten,

<sup>(83)</sup> So z.B. SCHMELLER, *Paulus*, 314, der die Ersetzung des Zweiges des edlen Ölbaums durch Zweige des wilden für paradox hält und weiter moniert, dass dies in der Sachhälfte keine Entsprechung habe.

<sup>(84)</sup> Vgl. RENGSTORF, "Ölbaum-Gleichnis", 143-146.

<sup>(85)</sup> Vgl. H.-M. LÜBKING, *Paulus und Israel im Römerbrief*. Eine Untersuchung zu Römer 9–11 (EHS.T 260; Frankfurt u.a. 1986) 115-116.

eines Baumes, der von Gottes Verheißung, dem Glauben der Väter und dem Evangelium Christi genährt wird. Über beiden liegen Licht *und* Schatten in im Grunde spiegelbildlicher Verkehrung. Die nicht an Christus glaubenden Juden sind zwar aus Gottes Verheißungs- und Glaubensgemeinde herausgebrochen, doch kann Gott sie, die κατὰ φύσιν zum Baum gehört haben, wieder einpflanzen. Die Heiden dagegen sind in das Kraftfeld der göttlichen Verheißung aufgenommen, doch bloß παρὰ φύσιν, so dass sie nicht sicher sein können, wieder ausgeschlossen zu werden.

\*  
\* \*

Als Erstes hat die Interpretation der Bildrede 11,16-24 das Nebeneinander von paränetischem und systematisch-theologischem Anliegen zu beachten. Wie die prononcierte, an die Heiden gerichtete Anrede und Ermahnung zeigt, steht die Paränese im Vordergrund, eng verknüpft aber mit einer theologischen Argumentation. Den Heiden wird zwar zugesichert, dass sie an den Verheißungen Gottes Anteil haben und im Gegensatz zu den Juden "im Glauben stehen" (11,20), doch werden sie zur Gottesfurcht ermahnt. Ihre Rettung hat Israels Fall zur Voraussetzung (11,11), ist aber zugleich auf dessen künftiges Heil hingeordnet und mit diesem unlösbar verknüpft, so dass jede Überheblichkeit ihrerseits fehlt<sup>(86)</sup>. Die Paränese bleibt daher nicht bei den Heiden stehen, sondern trägt mit dazu bei, die in 11,1.11 aufgeworfene Grundfrage nach der Verheißungstreue Gottes gegenüber Israel zu erhellen. Dies führt zu der doppelten, auf zwei Gruppen gehenden Intention, einerseits die Heiden zu ermahnen, andererseits die Treue Gottes gegenüber Israel zu begründen.

Der argumentative Charakter der Bildrede ist entscheidend geprägt durch eingeflochtene Kommentierungen. Der damit entstehende häufige Wechsel von Bild- und Sachhälfte ist ein Indiz, dass Paulus der Bildebene nur eine begrenzte Überzeugungskraft zubilligt. Das Anwendungspotential des Bildes, das er vielleicht aus der Tradition der Synagoge übernommen hat (Einfropfen fremder Zweige als Sinnbild für die Eingliederung von Proselyten), bleibt in der Tat begrenzt. Am deutlichsten belegt dies die Glaubenthematik in 11,20.23, die, obwohl von grundlegender Bedeutung für die im Raum stehende soteriologische Frage, in der Bildrede keine Entsprechung

<sup>(86)</sup> Mit SCHMELLER, *Paulus*, 299.

besitzt<sup>(87)</sup>. Hinzukommt, dass der Wechsel von Bild und Sache mit einer semantischen Unschärfe der einzelnen Bildelemente einhergeht. Die Auslegung wird daher deren Allegorisierung nur mit Maßen betreiben dürfen, eben nur im Rahmen des für die paulinische Argumentation Erforderlichen<sup>(88)</sup>.

Vor jeder Ausdeutung einzelner Bildelemente muss die Einsicht stehen, dass der Argumentation eine eindeutige Subjekt- und Handlungsträgerschaft Gottes zugrunde liegt. Neben expliziten Verweisen ([ὁ] θεός 11,21.22.23) wird sein machtvollendes Gerichts- und Retterhandeln häufig durch Passiva divina aufgerufen (11,17.19.20.22.23.24). Aus der Voraussetzung dieser theologischen Grunddynamik ergibt sich, dass Gott mit jedem einzelnen Bildelement in Beziehung steht, mit keinem aber identisch ist. Da Gott in der Bildebene als derjenige vorgestellt wird, der Zweige herausbricht und einpfropft, kann weder die Wurzel des Ölbaums noch Stamm oder Ölbaum selbst mit Gott als Person gleichgesetzt werden. Da die Zweige des edlen Baumes für die Israeliten stehen, fällt auch die Möglichkeit aus, die Wurzel auf Israel zu beziehen. Am ehesten plausibel ist daher eine Deutung auf Abraham bzw. die Väter. Die theologische Perspektive und Dynamik wird dadurch nicht relativiert, sondern unterstützt, sind die Väter doch erste und vorbildliche Träger der göttlichen Verheißungen. Insofern ist die Basisidentität der Wurzel die des λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (9,6), Gottes unverbrüchliches Erwählungs- und Verheißungswort.

Aus der Wurzel bestimmt sich nun auch die Bedeutung des ganzen Ölbaums. Eine Besonderheit dieses Baumes besteht nämlich darin, dass das Wurzelwerk nicht unter der Erde verborgen liegt, sondern in seiner massiven Gestalt von dem Stamm kaum unterschieden werden kann. So stellt Paulus den Heiden denn auch vor Augen, dass sie von der Wurzel des Baumes, dessen Zweige sie geworden sind, getragen werden (11,18). An einer Differenzierung von Wurzel und Stamm scheint Paulus also nicht gelegen. Von daher ist eine Allegorisierung des Ölbaums auf den Messias Christus hin auszuschließen. Aus der generischen Identität von Stamm und Wurzel ergibt sich vielmehr ein

(87) Kritisch dazu SCHMELLER, *Paulus*, 314: "Das Bild war nicht dazu geeignet, den theologischen Gedanken in jeder Hinsicht adäquat wiederzugeben: das entscheidende Manko ist, daß Glaube und Unglaube nicht einzubeziehen sind, die Sachhälfte also einen wesentlichen Vorsprung vor der Bildhälfte hat".

(88) Mit E. KÄSEMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a; Tübingen 1980) 295; SCHMITHALS, *Römerbrief*, 400.

erneuter Bezug auf den göttlichen Erwählungs- und Verheißungslogos, der hier jedoch nicht von den Vätern, sondern von Israel repräsentiert wird.

In der Summe erweist sich damit der λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ als das hermeneutisch entscheidende Referenzelement der Bildrede. Die Personidentitäten, die sich Baum, Wurzel und Zweigen zuordnen lassen, erscheinen nur mehr als Bedeutungsträger, welche den Logos Gottes in Glauben und Handeln performativ repräsentieren. Das göttliche Erwählungs- und Verheißungswort stellt die primäre semantische Bestimmung dar, von der aus die weiteren Bildbestimmungen sekundär abgeleitet werden. Diese Zuordnung aller Bildelemente unter eine dynamische Grundkategorie vermag nicht nur die Semantik der einzelnen Bildelemente gedanklich zusammenzuführen, sondern macht auch den Wechsel von Bild- und Sachhälfte transparent, der die Bildaussage semantisch entschieden bereichert. Über kommentierende Einsprengsel, die aus der Bildebene herausfallen, gelingt es Paulus nämlich, die Theo-logik auch christologisch zu perspektivieren. Die Christus-Aussagen in Röm 10–11 und der nachdrückliche Verweis auf die soteriologische Relevanz des Glaubens in 11,20.23 stellen zentrale Implikationen der göttlichen Heils- und Gerichtsdynamik dar, wie sie von Paulus im Ölbaumbild vorausgesetzt und weiter entfaltet wird. In welchem Verhältnis näherhin der Christusglaube zu dem in der Geschichte Israels wurzelnden Gotteslogos steht, bedürfte einer eigenen ausführlichen Untersuchung, die weitere Paulustexte einzubeziehen hätte. Dass der Messias Christus im Bild des Ölbaums keine Entsprechung hat, ist immerhin ein Hinweis darauf, dass beide Paradigmen in einem komplementären Verhältnis, „ungetrennt und unvermischt“, stehen. Das Verheißungswort Gottes bildet darin freilich die dynamische, die gesamte Heilsgeschichte umgreifende Grundkategorie.

Von diesem Dynamischarakter des göttlichen Verheißungswortes aus erschließt sich auch die temporale Struktur der Bildrede. Die Referenz auf Abraham und die Väter einerseits, auf Christus andererseits entschränkt das Bild des Ölbaums, das von dem soteriologischen Status der Gegenwart seinen Ausgang nimmt, auf Vergangenheit und Zukunft hin. Erst von dieser umfassenden Zeitperspektive her ist die Heilsplanung Gottes, wenn überhaupt, zu fassen. Die Reflexion auf die Wurzel als die für Juden wie Heiden grundlegende Bezugsgröße verankert die göttlichen Verheißungen in

dem vormosaïschen, "gesetzesfreien" Gotteswort, das über die Väter zu einer unwiderbringlichen Heilzusage an alle Völker der Menschheitsgeschichte eingepflanzt wurde. In ihrer die Schranken zwischen Israeliten und Heiden überwindenden Heilspotenz ist die Wurzel zugleich auch eine auf die eschatologische Zukunft hin ausgerichtete Größe. Der die Bildrede beschließende Hinweis, dass auch die ungläubigen Juden wieder eingepropft werden, blickt nämlich auf die von der Parusie Christi eingeleitete Endzeit voraus, in der Gott in seiner Macht und Gnade nach der Vollzahl der Heiden auch ganz Israel zum Heil führen wird (11,25-27). Der Ölbaum ist ein Hoffnungszeichen, das es nur zu ergreifen gilt, von Christen wie von Juden.

Bibliothek  
des Bischöflichen Priesterseminars  
Jesuitenstr. 13  
D-54290 Trier

Rainer SCHWINDT

#### SUMMARY

Exegesis and theology hope to gain important insights and fresh impetus for the Christian-Jewish dialogue from the metaphoric speech of Paul about the olive tree. The strong mutual penetration of figurativeness and interpretation as well as their primary paraenetic character imply however a varied semantics. The electing and promising word of God is the primary and decisive parameter of reference in the interpretation of the metaphoric structure. The interpretation of the individual image-elements as persons has to derive of it secondary. Their assignment is determined by the peculiar morphology of the olive tree. A look at growth and figure of the olive tree shows, that its roots, being nearly as strong as the trunk, can hardly be distinguished from it. Therefore a reference of the tree to Christ can be excluded. The traditional interpretation of the root as Abraham (or rather the patriarchs) and of the olive tree as Israel have the greatest plausibility on the secondary level. Both, Abraham and Israel, represent the electing and promising Logos of God. The faith-motive and further contextual indications give this theological basic dynamics a christological component too. The faith in Christ puts under the promising word of God. Pagans and Jews will take part on the olive tree of life, which is nourished on the promising of God, the faith of the patriarchs and the gospel of Christ.

# ANIMADVERSIONES

## **Small Lexemes, Large Semantics: Prepositions and Theology in the Golden Calf Episode (Exodus 32–34)**

For over a century the general scholarly consensus has been that Exod 32–34 is a pastiche of sources more or less at odds with one another<sup>(1)</sup>. More recently, synchronic approaches have sought to understand compositional features or unexpected dynamics within the text as part of the text's literary fabric, and several such studies have helped advance our understanding of this pericope<sup>(2)</sup>. This study, which studies the prepositions that describe divine presence (or absence) within Exod 32–34, plots a course between these two camps in contending that the pericope shows both dynamic development in the theme of Yahweh's presence and an overall coherence. In fact, the developments in divine presence are essential to the narrative's flow, and link the literary transitions in the text with the changing historical circumstances it describes<sup>(3)</sup>.

### *1. Exegetical Analysis*

The treatment of divine presence in Exod 32–34, leaving aside the negative attempt represented by the golden calf, contains the following stages: the angel replaces Yahweh's anticipated presence and Israel repents (32,29–33,6), the tent of meeting serves as an interlude (33,7–11), progressive restoration of divine presence is secured via intercession (33,12–17), Moses witnesses a culminating theophany (33,18–34,8), and a request for Yahweh to fully restore the covenant (34,9) is finally granted (34,10–28).

#### *a) Promised Divine Presence Revoked (32,29–33,6)*

Exod 33 opens with Yahweh continuing the speech to Moses which in chapter 32 enumerated the continuing consequences of the sin committed with the golden calf. First comes a command for Moses and his people to go from Sinai to the land Yahweh swore to the fathers (33,1); Yahweh will send an angel before them, and will extirpate the present inhabitants of Canaan (33,2). The reason that Yahweh will not go up among (בְּקִרְבּוֹ) the Israelites is given in 33,3 — since they are stiff-necked, he would consume them *en route*.

<sup>(1)</sup> Noth's opinion is representative when he states regarding these chapters that "the state of the sources is certainly extremely confused" (*Exodus* [OTL; London 1962] 243).

<sup>(2)</sup> For example, R.W.L. MOBERLY, *At the Mountain of God. Story and Theology in Exodus 32–34* (JSOTSS 22; Sheffield 1983).

<sup>(3)</sup> Thus Noth, who likewise recognizes that the theme of divine presence ties the section together, still underestimates the passage's unity: the pericopae have in common not merely a theme but a theme and its development due to theological mechanisms that they hold in common.



This is an explicit denial of the possibility of constructing the tabernacle at this point, the most horrific development possible given God's original intention in Exod 25,8<sup>(4)</sup>.

Once Yahweh sends Moses away to lead the people to Canaan without his being in front of or among them, this news reaches the people's ears and they mourn deeply (Hithpael of אבל) and refrain from putting on their ornaments. The differences between the two episodes of 33,1-4 and 5-6 are noteworthy. In the first, Yahweh's absence is the topic (לֹא אֶעֱלֶה בְּקִרְבְּךָ), and is in fact necessary lest he destroy them in the course of the journey (not immediately). In the second, Yahweh's punitive presence is the topic (אֶעֱלֶה בְּקִרְבְּךָ, not negated), and it is equal to the Israelites' being destroyed immediately. This suggests that Yahweh's two speeches here contain an escalation of the threat of judgment. Corresponding to this is a development in the people's responses. In Yahweh's first speech he gives no commands, and the people spontaneously abstain from donning their ornaments<sup>(5)</sup>. His second speech commands the permanent jettisoning (Hifil of יָרַד) of the people's ornaments, and the people obey heartily (Hithpael of נָצַל) and remain obedient to that command from Horeb on<sup>(6)</sup>. The mourning noted after the first speech (33,4) is intense (Hithpael of אבל), and it is reasonable to suppose that a similar disposition was continued or enhanced by the events described in the second response, since that involved long-term obedience to Yahweh (a rarity in this pericope!). The last important difference involves Yahweh's pondering of Israel's fate (33,6), unique to the second speech. The suspense this creates is heightened by the narrative's hiatus in 33,7-11, establishing this as a critical juncture in the golden calf episode. The tabernacle project remains canceled, and Yahweh's beneficent presence among the people is still ruled out.

#### b) The Tent of Meeting (33,7-11)

Most interpreters, regardless of their methodology, see this passage as hopelessly misplaced, often assuming that it represents an older, competing prophetic tradition (deriving from J) regarding the "tent of meeting." Consequently, there is thought to be a "profound theoretical and conceptual gap between the two concepts of the tent of meeting that have been preserved in the Torah" <sup>(7)</sup>.

<sup>(4)</sup> The thematic ties between Exod 32-34 and the tabernacle context of 25-31; 35-40 show that there is appreciable continuity between them. The fact that the non-Priestly material (on the usual understanding of 32-34) stresses the importance of Yahweh's presence in the same way as the key P passages of 25,8 and 29,45-46 is significant for showing that their treatment of divine presence is quite compatible.

<sup>(5)</sup> "In a setting of idol production, the non-use of the ornaments alludes to a general background of purification and renunciation." M.R. HAUGE, *The Descent from the Mountain*. Narrative Patterns in Exodus 19-40 (JSOTSS 323; Sheffield 2001) 77, with reference to Exod 19,10-15; Gen 35,1-4; Isa 3,18-26. A.M. Rodriguez reaches similar conclusions in his "Jewelry in the Old Testament," in *To Understand the Scripture*. Essays in Honor of William H. Shea (ed. D. MERLING) (Berrien Springs, MI: Institute of Archaeology/ Siegfried H. Horn Archaeological Museum 1997) 103-125 (esp. 115, 118).

<sup>(6)</sup> On the temporal nature of constructions like בְּהָרֵי חוֹרֵב, see Num 10,33; 21,4; 23,7; 33,24.41.48; 34,8, inter alia.

<sup>(7)</sup> I. KNOHL, "Two Aspects of the 'Tent of Meeting'", *Tehillah le-Moshe*. Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg (ed. M. COGAN ET AL.) (Winona Lake 1997) 74.

It is worth pondering whether the standard diachronic approach to this question has not adopted too simple a solution to the problem of these two clearly distinguished structures. Given the unsurpassed emphasis that Exodus puts on the tabernacle, if we assume the general competence of the book's final redactor he must not have considered the *'ōhel mō'ēd* a threat to the tabernacle's unique identity and function<sup>(8)</sup>. Ralph Hendrix, in a recent series of articles, attempts to make sense of the various terms used for Israel's cultic structures in the Sinai period and to demonstrate, without appealing to multiple source documents, the resultant coherence of the tabernacle section in Exod 25–40<sup>(9)</sup>. His studies succeed in highlighting the nuance that each term often possesses, even if their use remains puzzling at points. Hendrix concludes that “whereas the literary context of *miškān* was about construction, the literary context of *'ōhel mō'ēd* appears to involve the function of the cult of YHWH”<sup>(10)</sup>. But in contrast to a source-critical approach, Hendrix overemphasizes the similarity of the two structures to the point of seeing them as one, something that Exod 33,7–11 and Numbers 11, 12 do not allow.

Careful attention to the tent of meeting passage suggests that another understanding is possible. The question may be clarified, first, by defining the tent of meeting per its description in Exod 33: it is a tent located outside the camp for oracular purposes. This immediately distinguishes it from Moses' personal tent, mentioned earlier in Exod 18, and from the tabernacle, which is constructed later in Exod 40<sup>(11)</sup>. Second, the silence of Exodus regarding any tent with cultic or oracular functions prior to this point favors seeing the tent of meeting as first used at some time between Exod 19 and Exod 32–34<sup>(12)</sup>. This approach has the advantage of using more proximate textual and chronological contexts to understand the tent of meeting than solutions which connect the *'ōhel mō'ēd* with Moses' personal tent, with the tabernacle, or with Canaanite parallels<sup>(13)</sup>.

<sup>(8)</sup> M. Haran argues that the tabernacle and the tent of meeting served very different purposes, as their names (*miškān*, *'ōhel mō'ēd*) imply. The former was “where God dwells,” the latter “the place to which he comes at an appointed time . . . only to leave it when the communion . . . is over”, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel. An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Winona Lake <sup>2</sup>1985) 269.

<sup>(9)</sup> “A Literary Structural Overview of the Golden-Calf Episode in Exodus 32:1–33:6”, *AUSS* 28 (1990) 211–217; “*Miškān* and *'ōhel mō'ēd*: Etymology, Lexical Definitions, and Extra-biblical Usage”, *AUSS* 29 (1991) 213–224; “The Use of *miškān* and *'ōhel mō'ēd* in Exodus 25–40”, *AUSS* 30 (1992) 3–13; “A Literary Structural Overview of Exodus 25–40”, *AUSS* 30 (1992) 123–138.

<sup>(10)</sup> HENDRIX, “Use”, 9.

<sup>(11)</sup> Moses' personal tent is mentioned in 18,7 (with the definite article), but the placement of that episode is thematic rather than chronological. See E.E. CARPENTER, “Exodus 18: Its Structure, Style, Motifs and Function in the Book of Exodus”, *A Biblical Itinerary. In Search of Method, Form and Content. Essays in Honor of George W. Coats* (ed. E.E. CARPENTER) (JSOTSS 240; Sheffield 1997) 91–108, and D.A. GLATT, *Chronological Displacement in Biblical and Related Literatures* (SBLDS 139; Atlanta 1993).

<sup>(12)</sup> The frequentative verbal syntax in 33,7–11 strongly suggests that the tent of meeting existed prior to the events of Exod 33.

<sup>(13)</sup> A.M. COOPER – B.R. GOLDSTEIN, “At the Entrance to the Tent: More Cultic Resonances in Biblical Narrative”, *JBL* 116 (1997) 201–215, assert Canaanite influence on the presentation of the *'ōhel mō'ēd* here.

Exod 33,7-11 itself introduces additional considerations that shed light on the nature and function of the tent of meeting, though their exact placement in the flow of events in Exod 32-34 is unclear due to the frequentative verbs: Moses pitched the tent for himself (וַיִּסַּח מֹשֶׁה לְמַחֲנֵהוּ); it was at a good distance from the camp (מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה), occurring three times in 33,7-8); it was accessible to any Israelite who was seeking Yahweh (33,7); Moses' trips to and sessions at the tent were publicly noticed and valued (33,8); the pillar of cloud would descend upon Moses' reaching the tent, whereupon Yahweh would speak familiarly with him and the people would worship (33,9-11); and after each episode Moses (and any Israelite who may have accompanied him) would return to the camp, while Joshua would stay at the tent (33,11). The verbal syntax distinguishes the section 33,7-11 from its context, beginning with a *w-x-yiqtol* sequence which breaks the *wayyiqtol* string of the previous section, then continuing with several instances of וַיָּחִי (14).

We can now summarize the import of Exod 33,7-11 in the context of Exod 32-34. The location of the tent of meeting traces, in the pictorial language of divine presence, the progress of Moses' intercession, coming between the accompaniment of Yahweh's angel and Moses' prayer that Yahweh himself be present "with" corporate Israel (33,16). As 33,1-6 has just stated, Yahweh cannot appear in Israel's midst without breaking out in judgment against them. Thus the stress on the location of Moses' oracular tent outside the limits of the camp very closely follows the narrative's development. The possibility of a good spiritual disposition on the part of some Israelites is hinted at by the fact that some desired to meet with Yahweh at the tent, and that others esteemed these occasional theophanies important and appropriate for worship. Thus the later restoration of divine presence and the related reinstatement of the covenant are not without their subjective counterparts on the part of the Israelites. Lastly, the centrality of Moses as the only one by whom individual Israelites can approach Yahweh correlates with his indispensable role as corporate Israel's mediator (15). While Israel still stands exposed to Yahweh's wrath, and Yahweh will not come near them lest he destroy them, Moses' relation to Yahweh has not suffered at all because of the people's sin.

#### c) Progressive Restoration of Presence Secured via Intercession (33,12-17)

While at this point in the narrative Israel's apostasy has not had the dire effect first threatened by Yahweh, the material that follows it has until now very patiently spelled out its grave consequences in terms of the covenant (now fractured), sin (punished and yet not forgiven), and Yahweh's presence among Israel (now a *non est*). Moses' third prayer, to which we now turn,

(14) P.J. GENTRY, "The System of the Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew", *Hebrew Studies* 39 (1998) 13. The interruptive quality of *w-x-yiqtol* may signal an "actualising presentation" which highlights the information presented without necessarily locating it chronologically, as suggested by W. Schneider and also by A. NICCACCI, "Workshop: Narrative Syntax of Exodus 19-24", *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible*. Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996 (ed. E. VAN WOLDE) (Biblical Interpretation Series 29; Leiden 1997) 213.

(15) This is emphasized in 33,11 and by the framing of 33,12-17 by references to Yahweh's close relationship with Moses.

accelerates the pace of the story but retains the thematic complexity evident in earlier sections. It is concerned with the need for God's presence, both among Israel and with Moses. Moses first speaks in terms of "with me" (33,12) and "show me" (33,13); in response God promises rest to Moses (33,14). Subsequently Moses prays with regard both to Israel ("with us," 33,16) and to himself ("show me," 33,18). At the end of the interchange God promises to pass before Moses alone while revealing more of his character (33,19–34,4).

The initial part of Moses' conversation with God refers to the promised presence of the angel (32,34; 33,2). While noting that the angel will go before Israel (לפני), Moses further requests that the divine presence go with (עם) him, supporting George Coats's contention that "there is no indication that the angel alleviates the threat posed by God's absence"<sup>(16)</sup>. Moses' request assumes that his unique relationship with God entails God's sending someone with Moses and making God's ways known to him.

At this point in the story Moses' expectations and hopes for Israel have been placed in severe jeopardy, and that by the actions of the same God whom Moses had come to know over several decades. Moses' request has his own needs in view (albeit his needs as Israel's representative and mediator) even as it culminates in a request that Yahweh graciously reconsider his withdrawal from Israel. In requesting that Yahweh send someone *with* him, and that he show Moses his way, Moses is moving toward asking Yahweh to fully restore his presence among Israel.

Yahweh's response to this first petition of the third prayer is directed exclusively to Moses<sup>(17)</sup>. His presence (פניה) will go with Moses (הלך, though without an accompanying preposition), and he will give Moses "rest" (33,14). While presence has been a consistent theme in these chapters, the concept of rest is unexpected here. As a result translations ancient and modern have rendered the Hebrew in a variety of ways, but it seems best to retain the common rendering of the phrase as "I will give you rest," with that term signifying the full enjoyment of the covenant's goals<sup>(18)</sup>.

God's response in 33,14 is still not a full resolution of the situation. Widmer correctly observes that it merely deals with the ambiguity of who would accompany Moses, leaving aside entirely the issue of God's presence among Israel. It is to this, then, that Moses returns in 33,15–16. The increasing clarity and particularity of his prayer confirms that his ultimate concern is Yahweh's presence *among Israel*. In 33,15 Yahweh's presence is ambiguously "going," albeit in the context of Moses and the people leaving Sinai (note the first-person plural object on the verb הֵעֲלֵנוּ). In 33,16 Moses mentions the gracious nature of Yahweh's relationship with his people and

<sup>(16)</sup> G.W. COATS, "The King's Loyal Opposition: Obedience and Authority in Exodus 32–34", *Canon and Authority. Essays in Old Testament Religion and Theology* (eds. G.W. COATS – B.O. LONG (Philadelphia 1977) 100.

<sup>(17)</sup> In favor of seeing the rest promise addressed only to Moses, see COATS, "Opposition", 102; NOTH, *Exodus*, 257. Moberly argues (*Mountain of God*, 74) that "the promise of rest is given to Moses alone (*l'kā*, second person singular suffix), and Moses is seeking the divine favour not for himself alone but for the people too."

<sup>(18)</sup> Given the importance of the covenant throughout Exod 32–34 (note the tablet inclusio in 31,18; 34,29), it is difficult to adopt a more limited definition.

with Moses before asking God to go *with* (אִתָּם) them (again, a first-person plural suffix identifying Moses and Israel). The last element in this portion of the prayer ties Israel's unique identity to Yahweh's presence *with* Israel. Moses is praying that the full experience of Yahweh's presence that he knows, and the rest that he will experience, would be granted to Israel.

Yahweh's response in 33,17 to the petition of 33,15-16 is the clearest and most significant step in the restoration of his relationship with Israel since the breach occasioned by the golden calf. By affirming to Moses that he will grant "this thing you have mentioned," Yahweh commits to going *with* Israel. But not all has been resolved, as attention to the prepositions describing the proximity of divine presence will show. No less significantly, "there is still no explicit word about forgiveness" <sup>(19)</sup>.

#### d) The Culminating Theophany and Covenant Renewal (33,18-34,8)

Yahweh's definition of the forthcoming theophany describes how he will grant Moses' request to see his glory (33,18). Notably, "the revelation of God is in terms of his attributes rather than his appearance" <sup>(20)</sup>. This is important for understanding how God's two self-descriptions (33,19; 34,6-7) relate to their context. First, the order and selection of divine attributes in Exod 34 exhibit differences with respect to the descriptions of Yahweh earlier in Exodus. Widmer has contrasted the two self-disclosures of Exod 20,5-6 and 34,6-7, and shows that the latter differs significantly from the former.

In Exodus 34:6, YHWH commences with a fundamental statement about his nature. YHWH declares that He is basically merciful and gracious. Whereas [*sic*] in the Decalogue the "negative portion," i.e. the warning of divine visitation, precedes YHWH's merciful and gracious attributes. Moreover, in the first divine disclosure divine jealousy is given as the reason for judgment (20:5), while after the golden calf incident YHWH's jealousy is no longer directly related to judgment, but comes only later to expression as a general warning regarding the worship of other gods (cf. 34:14) <sup>(21)</sup>.

Second, the ordering and selection of the divine attributes point toward their role in resolving the crisis in Israel's relation to Yahweh. The burden of 33,19 is God's sovereignty in exercising his mercy toward whomever he will. This makes possible its application to Israel, despite their having demerited any divine indulgence. In 34,6-7 the predominance of Yahweh's compassionate and forgiving character "provides the basis for Moses to request a divine pardon for Israel in Exod 34:9" <sup>(22)</sup>.

<sup>(19)</sup> D.R. DAVIS, "Rebellion, Presence, and Covenant: A Study in Exodus 32-34", *WTJ* 44 (1982) 77.

<sup>(20)</sup> B. CHILDS, *The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia 1974) 596.

<sup>(21)</sup> M. WIDMER, *Moses, God, and the Dynamics of Intercessory Prayer. A Study of Exodus 32-34 and Numbers 13-14* (FAT II/8; Tübingen 2004) 184-185.

<sup>(22)</sup> T.B. DOZEMAN, "Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Yahweh's Gracious and Compassionate Character", *JBL* 108 (1989) 220-221.

e) Request for Yahweh to Fully Restore the Covenant (34,9)

Immediately after witnessing the theophany, Moses shows the relevance of the divine character just displayed and described by praying God to “go along in our midst, even though the people are so obstinate; and do pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us as your own possession.” Moses’ request to see God’s glory is not, as Terrien colorfully puts it, *libido theologica*, since both before and after the event Moses’ ultimate concern is Israel’s preservation as the people of God<sup>(23)</sup>.

Both the theological and narrational elements of the theophany connect directly to the final request of Moses in 34,9 and the subsequent renewal of the covenant in 34,10-28. First, the preposition בקרב in Moses’ last petition establishes that the account has finally come to discussion of fully restored divine proximity and presence among Israel. That God’s presence בקרב Israel was the ideal appears from the equivalent description of Yahweh’s dwelling among (בתוך) Israel in the tabernacle in 25,8 and 29,45, and especially from the denial in 33,3,5 that Yahweh could be בקרב Israel without destroying them<sup>(24)</sup>. Second, the problem of sin is not ignored, as the people’s repentance (33,4-6) and Moses’ importunate intercession together incline God to forgive graciously Israel’s sin. Finally, the first indicators of the covenant’s fracture in 32,7,19, Yahweh’s telling Moses that Israel belonged to Moses and Moses’ breaking of the tablets, have likewise been resolved by Moses’ petition that Yahweh once again take Israel as his inheritance and by Yahweh’s call for new tablets.

## 2. Theological Reflections

On the basis of the above exegesis we can now summarize the developments in the treatment of divine presence within Exod 32–34, recognizing the equally critical role of Israel’s sinfulness which jeopardizes it<sup>(25)</sup>. After its introduction in Exod 32, this tension between divine presence and its endangerment by Israel’s sin continues in the following chapters. On the one hand stands the (still inchoate) tabernacle, to be built expressly to establish Yahweh’s permanent presence among the people; on the other stand the golden calf and Israel’s apostasy and idolatry, which have rendered Yahweh’s beneficent presence impossible at this point in the narrative. As we

<sup>(23)</sup> S. TERRIEN, *The Elusive Presence*. Toward a New Biblical Theology (Religious Perspectives 26; San Francisco 1978) 144.

<sup>(24)</sup> See S.S. TUELL, “תוך”, *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (ed. W. VAN GEMEREN) (Grand Rapids 1997) IV, 279-280; S. RATTRAY – J. MILGROM, “קרב”, *TDOT* XIII, 148-152. Especially in the context of the tabernacle (cf. Exod 25,8; 29,45-46; Lev 26,11-12), one would indeed expect that full divine presence would be described with בתוך and בקרב rather than simply via עם.

<sup>(25)</sup> Thus W. Brueggemann’s aptly titled “The Crisis and Promise of Presence in Israel”, IDEM, *Old Testament Theology*. Essays on Structure, Theme, and Text (ed. P.D. MILLER) (Minneapolis 1992) 150-182. Notably, Brueggemann focuses on the paradox of God being “present in Israel but hidden from Israel” but does not integrate Israel’s forgiveness in his discussion (169, his emphasis). For an exploration of the interrelation of divine presence and forgiveness in this context, see my “Creation, Tabernacle and Sabbath: The Function of the Sabbath Frame in Exodus 31:12-17; 35:1-3” (Ph.D. diss., Trinity International University 2006).



have seen, the resolution of this tension is a primary theme in Exod 32–34, and its gradual realization is seen in the careful choice of the prepositions that specify Yahweh’s proximity to Israel. After Yahweh agrees not to destroy Israel immediately after their making of the golden calf, Moses (and later the Levites) execute judgment on the offenders (32,15-29). The next day Yahweh speaks of his presence vis-à-vis Israel only negatively, with the verb בָּקַר, so that when he “visits” Israel he will punish their sin (32,33-34). But beginning in chapter 33, Yahweh’s proximity to Israel takes on increasingly positive aspects: first he sends his angel in front of Israel (לְפָנֶי, as originally promised in 23,30-23), then himself agrees to go with Israel (עִם) and finally to go among them (בְּקִרְבֵּן). The significance of this movement is bolstered by its correlation with the progressive covenant reestablishment that culminates in chapter 34 (see table below).

#### Dynamics of Divine Presence in Exod 32-34

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Moses’ Action</i>	<i>Divine Response</i>
32,30-35	Moses attempts to atone for people’s sin	Yahweh says his proximity (פָּקַד) will involve punishment; an angel will go לְפָנֶי Israel
33,1-33,11	Moses prays that God would forgive Israel (חַשְׁמַתָּה + שָׁאָה)	Yahweh says his angel will go לְפָנֶי Israel; God himself will not go בְּקִרְבֵּן Israel lest he destroy her
33,7-11	Interruption: the <i>’ōhel mō’ēd</i>	
33,12-34,3	Moses intercedes, asking God to go with (עִם) him, then with (עִם) Israel	First Yahweh will go with (עִם) Moses (33,12; cf. 33,14), then perhaps go with (עִם) Moses and Israel (33,15), and finally <i>will</i> go with (עִם) Moses and Israel (33,16)
34,4-9	Moses asks God to go among (בְּקִרְבֵּן) Israel and fully restore her	Yahweh agrees to go בְּקִרְבֵּן Israel

FAREL, Faculté de Théologie Réformée  
3407-A, av. du Musée  
Montréal, Québec H3G 2C6; Canada

Daniel TIMMER

#### SUMMARY

Despite the current methodological impasse with which OT studies continues to wrestle, this study shows that dynamic elements within the text can, somewhat surprisingly, contribute to the text’s coherence. The various prepositions and statements regarding divine presence in Exod 32–34 are fundamental to the development and integrity of the narrative as it stands. Further, the fact that this complex progression in divine presence spans pericopae usually attributed to various sources suggests that the various pericopae are more in harmony with one another than is often recognized. These conclusions call for renewed attention to the text of Exodus as it stands, both within the golden calf episode and more broadly.



## Zur Deutung von Jes 45,11b

הַאֲתִיּוֹת שְׂאֵלֹנִי עַל־בְּנֵי וְעַל־פֶּעַל יְדֵי הַצֹּמֵנִי

Das Kommende müsst ihr bei mir erfragen; über meine Söhne, das Werk meiner Hände, müsst ihr mir die Befehlsgewalt überlassen.

Der vorliegende Beitrag möchte in Treue zum masoretischen Text die Richtigkeit der in dieser Übersetzung enthaltenen Deutung aufzeigen. Sie ist keineswegs neu; doch besteht erheblicher Argumentationsbedarf. Es werden sich eine Reihe von Problemfeldern auftun. Selbst der masoretische Text in Reinform, mit Zäsur hinter שְׂאֵלֹנִי, stellt die Frage, was mit פֶּעַל יְדֵי וְעַל־בְּנֵי gemeint ist. Bezeichnet פֶּעַל יְדֵי, wie schon die LXX mit περὶ τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν μου zu verstehen gibt, das Heilswirken Jahwes oder nicht doch, explikativ zu “meine Söhne”, das Volk Jahwes? Hat עַל־בְּנֵי die Bedeutung “Befehle erteilen bezüglich” oder nicht doch “als Befehlshaber einsetzen über”? Verlegt man — zu Unrecht und gegen die Auffassung der Masoreten — die Zäsur hinter עַל־בְּנֵי, was seit den Tagen der LXX wie auch der Vg immer wieder geschehen ist, so kann עַל־בְּנֵי wegen des Parallelismus mit עַל־בְּנֵי nur noch “Befehle erteilen bezüglich” bedeuten.

Sieht man von der Problematik der Satzeinteilung ab, so war der Wortlaut des hebräischen Textes bis in die Zeit der modernen Bibelkritik nur in einem Punkt belastet. Die Peschitta und vielleicht die Qumran-Handschrift 1QIs<sup>a</sup> haben statt אֲתִיּוֹת “das Kommende” den Plural von אֵימָה “Zeichen” (in 1QIs<sup>a</sup> (הַאֲתִיּוֹת)) gelesen, eine Variante, die in der Lutherbibel und sogar in der Bible de Jérusalem zu unverdienten Ehren gekommen ist. Die LXX hat keine vom masoretischen Wortlaut abweichende Vorlage gekannt. Dass sie אֲתִיּוֹת mit dem Schlusswort von 45,11a verbindet und dabei יִצְרֵנִי statt יִצְרֵךְ liest, ist ein Versehen des Übersetzers und für unsere Argumentation unerheblich; erst recht, dass sie den Söhnen die Töchter hinzufügt.

Es war die moderne Bibelkritik, die zu einschneidenden konjekturalen Eingriffen überging. Anstelle von אֲתִיּוֹת שְׂאֵלֹנִי wurde אֲתִיּוֹת שְׂאֵלֹנִי oder אֲתִיּוֹת שְׂאֵלֹנִי konjektiert, wobei der Anfangsbuchstabe *He* nicht mehr als Artikel sondern als *He interrogativum* verstanden wird. Für שְׂאֵל bietet sich die Bedeutung “zur Rede stellen” statt der gewöhnlichen Bedeutung “fragen” an. So ergeben sich gängige Übersetzungen wie “Wollt ihr mir etwa Vorwürfe machen wegen meiner Söhne und Vorschriften über das Werk meiner Hände” (so die Deutsche Einheitsübersetzung). Wie selbstverständlich wird die Zäsur hinter עַל־בְּנֵי verlegt, was dann die oben erwähnte Auswirkung auf die Bedeutung von עַל־בְּנֵי hat. In Kommentaren und besonders in Bibelausgaben hat der konjekturale Eingriff viel Anklang gefunden. Von der Forschung insgesamt kann man dies nur eingeschränkt sagen. Dies wird sich zeigen, wenn es nun im Folgenden einen Weg durch das Dickicht der Meinungen zu bahnen gilt.

1. *š'ālûnî ist nicht durch tiš'ālûnî zu ersetzen.*

Man glaubt dies unter anderem dem Parallelismus zwischen den beiden Verbalformen schuldig zu sein. Die Imperfektform *tiš'ālûnî* gewinnt man, indem man dem vorausgehenden *h'tywt* (= *hā'otiyyôt*) den Schlußkonsonanten *Taw* wegnimmt, was dann zugleich erlaubt, *h'tywt* durch eine völlig andere Lesart zu ersetzen (vgl. Nr. 2)(<sup>1</sup>).

Gegen die Lesart *tiš'ālûnî*, die rein konjunktural ist (<sup>2</sup>), spricht insbesondere, daß die Weiterführung eines Imperativs durch eine Imperfektform, im vorliegenden Fall *š'ālûnî* durch *ʿšawwunî*, bibelhebräischer Sprachgebrauch ist, und zwar bei Parallelismus in poetischen Texten (<sup>3</sup>).

2. *hā'otiyyôt ist nicht durch eine konjekturale Lesart zu ersetzen.*

Wie hoch eine Textänderung im Kurs steht, geht schon allein daraus hervor, daß BHK anstelle von *hā'otiyyôt* *š'ālûnî* kurzerhand *ha'attaem tiš'ālûnî* ("wollt ihr mich etwa fragen, d.h. zur Rede stellen?") als legendum angibt und BHS ebenso bedenkenlos *ha'otî tiš'ālûnî*.

Die Konjekturen sind verlockend, weil sie der Aussagetendenz von 45,9-10 zu entsprechen scheinen. Auch der durch die Konjekturen entstehende Fragesatz paßt zu dem gleichfalls mit *He interrogativum* beginnenden Fragesatz von 45,9b. Das *He interrogativum* leitet gern eine Frage ein, auf die eine negative Antwort erwartet wird.

Beide Konjekturen haben jedoch keine Chance. Der Eindruck, den BHK und BHS sowie Übersetzungen und Kommentare heute erwecken, entspricht auf keinen Fall der Forschungssituation in älterer Zeit (<sup>4</sup>).

Für die Beibehaltung von *hā'otiyyôt* "die kommenden Dinge" spricht außer der Tatsache, daß die erwähnten Konjekturen mit der unanfechtbaren Imperativform *š'ālûnî* nicht in Übereinstimmung zu bringen sind (vgl. Nr. 1), sehr nachdrücklich der weitere Kontext. Die Form *'otiyyôt*, eine feminine Pluralform des Partizips von *'âtâ* "kommen", ist mit Artikel außer in 45,11b noch in 41,23 zu finden, ferner ohne Artikel in 44,7. An allen drei Stellen geht

(<sup>1</sup>) Wer *hā'otiyyôt* beibehält und sich gleichwohl für *tiš'ālûnî* entscheidet, nimmt an, daß das seiner Meinung nach ursprüngliche *Taw* in *tiš'ālûnî* durch Haplographie verloren gegangen ist. So jetzt auch die *Nova Vulgata* (Numquid ventura interrogatis me ...), die übrigens mit anderen in *hā'otiyyôt* nicht einen Artikel sondern ein *He interrogativum* annimmt.

(<sup>2</sup>) Das Targum übersetzt: *d'tydn lmyty 'twn š'lyn mn qdmy*. ("Was bereit ist zu kommen, seid ihr fragend von mir"). In der Vorlage hat jedoch kaum die Imperfektform *tiš'ālûnî* gestanden.

(<sup>3</sup>) Vgl. Jes 45,8a.21a; Ps 17,8; 43,1; 54,3; 59,2; 64,2; 140,2; Ijob 6,23; 40,10; Spr 7,1; 22,17. Aus Spr 22,17 geht hervor, daß es sich bei einer solchen Weiterführung eines Imperativs nicht um Jussiv- sondern um Imperfektformen handelt. Schon die LXX, die dem Imperativ *š'ālûnî* treu bleibt, gibt die weiterführende Imperfektform *ʿšawwunî* idiomatisch korrekt mit einem Imperativ wieder.

(<sup>4</sup>) Ein kompetenter Verteidiger des TM ist D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancient Testament* (OBO 50/2; Fribourg/Göttingen 1986) II, 341-342. H. Leene, der sich intensiv mit den Jes 45,11b betreffenden Fragen auseinandergesetzt hat, ist in einem späteren Beitrag zum TM zurückgekehrt. Vgl. H. LEENE, "Universalisme or Nationalisme? Isaia XLV 9-13 and its Context", *Bijdragen* 35 (1974) 309-334 und H. LEENE, *De vroegere en de nieuwe dingen bij Deuterocesaja* (Amsterdam 1987) bes. 192-195.

es um das in Jes 40–48 wichtige Thema der Vorhersage<sup>(5)</sup>. Für den Nachweis der Authentizität von *hā'otiyyôt* in 45,11b ist nun ein Vergleich zwischen 45,11b und 41,23 im jeweiligen Kontext der Stellen aufschlußreich. In beiden Zusammenhängen (45,9–13 und 41,21–29) folgen aufeinander in fast gleichem Abstand ein *hā'otiyyôt* und ein *hā'irōtîhû* bzw. *hā'irōtî*, das die Erweckung des Kyrus ausdrückt (vgl. 45,11b.13a und 41,23.25). Die Erweckung des Kyrus ist nach 41,26 eine Sache der Vorhersage; sie ist es auch in 45,9–13, da sie zu den *'otiyyôt* zählt, die niemand kennt und die daher nach 45,11b beim Gott Israels erfragt werden müssen. Es dürfte aussichtslos sein, *hā'otiyyôt* in 45,11b durch eine Konjekture zu ersetzen.

Die Verwandtschaft zwischen 45,9–13 und 41,21–29 wird durch sonstige Übereinstimmungen bestätigt. So findet man in 45,9 *rîb* “einen Rechtsstreit führen” und in 41,21 das entsprechende Substantiv. Dem *po'al yāday*, dem Werk der Hände des Gottes Israels in 45,11b (vgl. auch 45,9b), steht in 41,24 *po'al* der Götzen gegenüber. Sowohl in 45,11b als auch in 41,28 erscheint *šā'al* “erfragen”, wobei es sich jeweils um Erfragen des Kommenden handelt<sup>(6)</sup>. Das Begriffspaar *homaer* “Lehm” und *yōšer* “Bildner” in 45,9b (vgl. auch 45,9a.11a) und 41,25, das sich in 41,25 allerdings nicht auf Gott und sein Gebilde sondern auf das Handeln des Kyrus bezieht, sagt immerhin etwas über das Vokabular des Verfassers.

Schon immer fand, was *'otiyyôt* betrifft, die Variante *'wtwt* (= *'ôtôt*) Beachtung, die als Plural von *'ôt* “Zeichen” aufgefaßt werden kann. In 1QIs<sup>a</sup> ist für Jes 45,11b *h'wtwt* (= *hā'ôtôt*) bezeugt; in 41,23 und 44,7 stimmt 1QIs<sup>a</sup> dagegen mit dem TM überein. Abgesehen davon, daß *hā'ôtôt* eine Nebenform des femininen Partizips *hā'otiyyôt* sein kann, ist auch damit zu rechnen, daß der Kopist in 45,11b versehentlich den Buchstaben *Jod* ausgelassen hat. Er kann aber auch irrtümlicherweise wirklich an *'ôtôt* “Zeichen” gedacht haben<sup>(7)</sup>. Die Peschitta setzt ja gleichfalls in 45,11b sowie in 41,23 und 44,7 (hier konflierend) die Bedeutung “Zeichen” voraus. Vor allem im Licht des Vergleichs von 45,9–13 mit 41,21–29 ist die Annahme von *'ôtôt* “Zeichen” in 45,11b eine Fehlentscheidung<sup>(8)</sup>.

### 3. Die Satzeinteilung des TM verdient den Vorzug.

Der TM setzt bei *š'ālūnî* den trennenden *zāqef qātôn*, so daß nicht nur *w'al-po'al yāday* sondern auch *'al-bānay* mit *t'šawwunî* zu verbinden ist. Heute wird oft ohne viel Federlesens die Zäsur hinter *'al-bānay* verlegt. Die vier Satzelemente stehen dann in chiasmischer Anordnung. Es wird wohl auch als Empfehlung gewertet, daß die zweite Satzhälfte nicht wie im TM asyndetisch sondern syndetisch beginnt.

<sup>(5)</sup> Vgl. Jes 41,24–27; 42,9; 43,9.12; 44,7–8.26; 45,11.21; 46,10–11; 48,1–16.

<sup>(6)</sup> Zur Bedeutung von *šā'al* vgl. auch Nr. 5.

<sup>(7)</sup> So nach K. ELLIGER, *Deuterocesaja* (BK XI/1 Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) I, 526–527 und H.-J. HERMISSON, *Deuterocesaja* (BK XI,7; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1987) 10.

<sup>(8)</sup> Vgl. bes. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle*, 327–328 (zu Jes 44,7) und 341–342 (zu Jes 45,11). Die Bible de Jérusalem entscheidet sich seit der Gesamtausgabe von 1973 in Jes 45,11b für die Bedeutung “Zeichen”, nicht jedoch in 41,23 und 44,7. Bei Luther liest man in Jes 45,11b: “Fodder (sic) von mir die Zeichen”. Mit “Zeichen” übersetzt er auch in 44,7, nicht jedoch in 41,23.

Die Masoreten dürften jedoch im Recht sein. Sie hatten ein Gespür dafür, daß die Vorhersage, zu der allein der Gott Israels fähig ist, in Jes 40–48 etwas derart Grundsätzliches ist, daß es nicht durch “bezüglich meiner Söhne” eingengt werden darf. Das bestätigen die beiden anderen *’otiyyôt*-Stellen 41,23 und 44,7. Stilistisch liegt der Nachdruck auf den beiden Verbalformen *š’ālûnî* und *ʿšawwunî*, die jeweils die beiden Satzhälften wuchtig abschließen. Der ungleiche Umfang der Satzhälften ist mit dadurch bedingt, daß *poʿal yāday* sich explikativ an *bānay* anschließt.

Bei der Beurteilung der Satzeinteilung hat die Bedeutung von *ʿšawwunî* ein Wort mitzureden. Bedeutet *šiwwâ pʿlonî ʿal* in Jes 45,11b “jemand einen Befehl erteilen bezüglich” oder “jemand (als Gebieter) einsetzen über”? Die erstgenannte Bedeutung steht lexikalisch außer Frage<sup>(9)</sup>. Aber auch die Bedeutung “jemand einsetzen über”, die wir in 45,11b für zutreffend halten, läßt sich gut belegen. Nicht wenige Autoren haben sich in 45,11b für sie entschieden<sup>(10)</sup>. Es handelt sich um eine gefestigte semantische Ausprägung<sup>(11)</sup>. Für die semantische Eigenständigkeit sprechen unter anderem verschiedene Varianten, die zum Teil durch Ellipsen zustande gekommen sind. Ellipsen sind geradezu ein Indiz für semantische Eigenständigkeit. Man beachte, daß die Bedeutung der Präposition *ʿal* in der semantischen Ausprägung “jemand einsetzen über (*ʿal*)” nicht etwa herkommt von der Bedeutung, die *ʿal* in der Wendung “jemand einen Befehl erteilen bezüglich (*ʿal*)” eigen ist. Die semantische Herkunft ist vielmehr zu suchen in Wendungen wie *nāgîd ʿal* “Herrscher über”.

Die Belege für “jemand einsetzen über” weisen folgende Varianten auf:

- šiwwâ pʿlonî lʿnāgîd ʿal* (1 Sam 13,14; 25,30);
- šiwwâ pʿlonî nāgîd* (ohne *lʿ-*) *ʿal* (2 Sam 6,21);
- šiwwâ pʿlonî lihyôt nāgîd ʿal* (1 Kön 1,35; ähnlich Neh 5,14, wo jedoch mit *bʿ-* statt mit *ʿal* konstruiert wird);
- šiwwâ pʿlonî lirʿôt ʿaet ...* (2 Sam 7,7=1 Chr 17,6)<sup>(12)</sup>;
- šiwwâ pʿlonî ʿal* (Jes 45,11b; 1 Chr 22,12; Neh 7,2; jeweils mit Ellipse eines Titels wie *nāgîd*)<sup>(13)</sup>;

<sup>(9)</sup> Vgl. Gen 12,20; Num 8,22; 2 Sam 14,8; 1 Kön 11,10; Jer 39,11; Nah 1,14; Mal 3,22; 1 Chr 22,13. In 2 Sam 18,5 steht deutlicher *ʿal-dʿbar* und in Jer 7,22 *ʿal-dibrê*.

<sup>(10)</sup> Vgl. u.a. F. DELITZSCH, *Commentar über das Buch Jesaja* (Leipzig 41889, Neudruck Gießen 1984); C. VON ORELLI, *Der Prophet Jesaja* (München 31904); B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Göttingen 1892, 21902); E. KÖNIG, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Gütersloh 1926); J. RIDDERBOS, *De profeet Jesaja II* (Kampen 31953); BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle*, 342.

<sup>(11)</sup> Dies wird zu Unrecht in Zweifel gezogen von LEENE, *De vroegere en de nieuwe dingen*, 193. Eingehend F. GARCÍA LÓPEZ, “*šiwwâ*”, *ThWAT* VI, 936-959, bes. 952-954, der jedoch in Jes 45,11b die von uns vertretene Semantik nicht anerkennt (vgl. 955). Zu einer ähnlichen semantischen Entwicklung im Arabischen vgl. L. KOPF, “Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch”, *VT* 8 (1958) 197-198. Semantisch ganz anderer Art sind die Wendungen *šiwwâ lʿ-* (2 Kön 20,1/Jes 38,1), *šiwwâ ʿael* (Gen 50,16; 2 Sam 17,23) und *šiwwâ ʿaet* (Gen 49,29.33; 1 Kön 2,1), die an den genannten Stellen soviel bedeuten wie “bestellen, kommen lassen”. Wieder anders *šiwwâ ʿal* in Jes 10,6 (“in den Krieg entsenden gegen”) und Esra 8,17 (“zu jemand senden”).

<sup>(12)</sup> In 1 Chr 22,6 dagegen ist *šiwwâ pʿlonî libnôt* trotz 1 Chr 22,12 wohl nicht so zu verstehen, daß Salomo als König eingesetzt wird, um den Tempel zu bauen; er wird von David beauftragt, den Tempel zu bauen.

<sup>(13)</sup> Schon LXX und Vg haben in 1 Chr 22,12 die in Jes 45,11b anzunehmende Bedeutung von *šiwwâ ʿal* erfaßt, nicht jedoch in Neh 7,2.

*šiwwâ šop'fîm 'al* (2 Sam 7,1=1 Chr 17,10; mit Ellipse der Personen, die als Richter eingesetzt werden);

*šiwwâ p'lônî* (Num 27,19.23; Dtn 31,14.23; Jos 1,9; jeweils mit Ellipse sowohl des Amtes als auch des Personenkreises, über den jemand eingesetzt wird)<sup>(14)</sup>.

In Jes 45,11b handelt es sich um die teilweise elliptische Variante *šiwwâ p'lônî 'al* "jemand (als Gebieter) einsetzen über", die auch in 1 Chr 22,12 und Neh 7,2 vorliegt.

Dem poetischen Charakter von Jes 45,11b ist zugute zu halten, daß das Volk, über das der Gott Israels als Herrscher "eingesetzt" zu werden verlangt, "meine Söhne" und "Werk meiner Hände" genannt wird. Der Einwand mancher Ausleger, daß Übertragung von Macht immer durch Höhergestellte erfolgt, hätte unseren kühnen Poeten nicht beeindruckt.

Man hat darauf hingewiesen, daß *šiwwâ*, konstruiert mit einem Akkusativ, in Jes 45,12b, also in unmittelbarer Nähe von 45,11b, die Bedeutung "Befehle erteilen" aufweist. Muß es da nicht auch in 45,11b heißen: "... bezüglich (*'al*) des Werks meiner Hände gebt ihr mir Befehle"? Dagegen ist zu bedenken, daß unterschiedliche semantische Ausprägungen sich wie unterschiedliche Termini verhalten können, und das sogar im selben Zusammenhang<sup>(15)</sup>. So steht in 1 Sam 13,14 *šiwwâ 'al* in der Bedeutung "(als Fürsten) einsetzen über" und im selben Satz ein mit doppeltem Akkusativ konstruiertes *šiwwâ* in der Bedeutung "(jemand etwas) befehlen"; die zweite Bedeutung findet sich auch im vorausgehenden Vers 1 Sam 13,13. Ein weiteres Beispiel bietet 1 Chr 22,12-13. Während in V. 12 die Wendung *šiwwâ p'lônî 'al* die Bedeutung "jemand (als Herrscher) einsetzen über" aufweist, ist im folgenden V. 13 die Rede von Satzungen und Rechtsnormen, die Jahwe dem Mose aufgetragen hat (*šiwwâ*) für (*'al*) Israel.

Nun zu den angekündigten Konsequenzen für die Satzeinteilung. Wenn *šiwwâ 'al* in Jes 45,11b die Bedeutung "Befehlsgewalt erteilen über" hat, dann ist der Parallelismus zwischen *'al-bānay* und *'al-po'al yāday*, wie er sich bei der üblichen Änderung der masoretischen Satzeinteilung ergibt, nicht länger möglich. Die Änderung setzt nämlich voraus, daß *'al* in beiden Wendungen "bezüglich" bedeutet. Das ist aber bei *šiwwâ p'lônî 'al* in der Bedeutung "jemand (als Gebieter) einsetzen über" gerade nicht der Fall. Da jedoch *'al* in beiden Wendungen offensichtlich die gleiche Bedeutung hat, ist nicht nur *'al-po'al yāday* sondern auch *'al-bānay* mit *t'sawwunî* zu verbinden.

#### 4. Was ist mit *po'al yāday* gemeint?

Im Vorausgehenden (Nr. 3) wurde bereits bemerkt, daß das Volk Jahwes gemeint ist. Diese Auffassung, die in der Forschung durchaus vertreten

<sup>(14)</sup> In Num 27,23 gibt die LXX das hier vorausgesetzte Verständnis zu erkennen, nicht jedoch an den anderen für *šiwwâ p'lônî* angeführten Stellen. Natürlich kann *šiwwâ p'lônî* anderswo die Bedeutung "jemand einen Befehl erteilen" haben. Zu *šiwwâ 'aet* "jemand bestellen, kommen lassen" vgl. Anm. 11.

<sup>(15)</sup> Man vergleiche das Nebeneinander von *yāšab* "wohnen" und *yāšab* "sitzen" in Ex 2,15. Man könnte, um Gen 48,7 weiter auszumalen, *baddaeraek* (= unterwegs) etwas *baddaeraek* (= auf der Wegfläche) liegen sehen und die Reise *bdaeraek 'aeprät* (= auf der Route nach Efrat) fortsetzen.

wird<sup>(16)</sup>, ist an sich nicht abhängig von der Satzeinteilung oder der Bedeutung von *tʿšawwunî*. Gleichwohl paßt sie besser zu der oben vorgelegten Deutung von *tʿšawwunî*. Diese läßt nämlich bei Übertragung von Herrschaft spontan an eine Gemeinschaft oder ein Volk denken und eher nicht, wie gelegentlich vorgeschlagen wird, an das in Jes 45,12-13 ausgedrückte Schöpfungs- und Heilswirken Jahwes<sup>(17)</sup>.

Für unsere Auffassung kann zunächst geltend gemacht werden, daß synonyme Wendungen an einigen Stellen mit Sicherheit das Volk bzw. ein Volk bezeichnen. So wird in Jes 19,25 Assur "das Werk meiner Hände (*ma<sup>a</sup>šeh yāday*)" genannt. Die im selben Vers vorkommenden Wendungen "mein Volk Ägypten" und "mein Erbe Israel" schließen jeden Zweifel aus. In Jes 29,23 heißt es: "Denn wenn er (Jakob) sieht seine Kinder, das Werk meiner Hände (*ma<sup>a</sup>šeh yāday*), in seiner Mitte ..". Die Wendung "seine Kinder", die schon die LXX in ihrer Vorlage hatte, wird vorschnell als Glosse betrachtet; man findet sie hinderlich, weil man "das Werk meiner Hände" vom Heilshandeln Jahwes verstehen möchte. Dann hätte jedenfalls der Glossator "das Werk meiner Hände" vom Volk verstanden<sup>(18)</sup>. In Jes 60,21 ist das Volk "ein Sproß meiner Pflanzung, das Werk meiner Hände (*ma<sup>a</sup>šeh yāday*)". Eine besonders beachtenswerte Stelle ist noch Jes 64,7. Hier heißt es in 64,7a: "Unser Vater bist du". Dies erinnert schon an 45,11b ("meine Söhne") und sogar an 45,10. Dann folgt in 64,7b: "Wir sind der Lehm (*homaer*) (vgl. 45,9b), und du bist unser Bildner (*yoš<sup>c</sup>renû*) (vgl. 45,11a sowie 45,9a.b), und das Werk deiner Hand (*ma<sup>a</sup>šeh yād<sup>kā</sup>*) sind wir alle". Damit die Identität von "Werk deiner Hand" und "dein Volk" vollends sichergestellt wird, wird in 64,8b hinzugefügt: "Dein Volk sind wir alle".

Man könnte einwenden, daß die angeführten Stellen nicht wie Jes 45,11b von *poʿal* sondern von *ma<sup>a</sup>šeah* sprechen. Dem ist entgegenzuhalten, daß *poʿal* im Hebräischen zwar einen poetischen Anstrich hat, aber durchaus mit *ma<sup>a</sup>šeah* auswechselbar ist. In Jes 41,24 und 41,29 entsprechen einander *poʿal* und *ma<sup>a</sup>šeah*. In Jes 59,6 stehen die beiden Termini parallel. In Jes 45,9b, also im Kontext von Jes 45,11b, hat das Verbum *ʿāśā* einen Bezug auf das Nomen *poʿal*<sup>(19)</sup>.

Mit einer gewissen Vorsicht kann Jes 40,10 (= 62,11) herangezogen werden. Das heimkehrende Volk ist hier "Erwerb (*p<sup>c</sup>ullā*)" Jahwes. Vorsicht ist geboten, weil *p<sup>c</sup>ullā* semantisch nicht völlig deckungsgleich mit *poʿal* ist. Die bei *p<sup>c</sup>ullā* stark hervortretende Bedeutung "Erwerb" scheint bei *poʿal* nur in Jer 22,13 und Ijob 7,2 gegeben zu sein. Immerhin kehrt Jahwe an den

(16) Vgl. etwa die in Anm. 10 angeführten Autoren, die übrigens auch die masoretische Satzeinteilung vertreten; ferner E.J. KISSANE, *The Book of Isaiah II* (Dublin 1943); R.P. MERENDINO, *Der Erste und der Letzte*. Eine Untersuchung von Jes 40-48 (VTS 37; Leiden 1981) 427. Duhm hält allerdings *ʿal-bānay* für eine Glosse zu *poʿal yāday*. Nicht der Autor sondern ein Glossator habe unter *poʿal yāday* das Volk Israel verstanden. Er beachtet nicht, daß in 45,9-10 nicht nur das "Werk" sondern auch die "Söhne" von 45,11b gleichsam bildhaft angekündigt werden.

(17) In LEENE, "Universalisme", 312, 316 sowie LEENE, *De vroegere en de nieuwe dingen*, 194 wird sogar zu Unrecht vermutet, daß *poʿal* immer das Handeln selbst und so gut wie nie das hervorgebrachte Werk bezeichnet.

(18) Zu einer analogen Auffassung Duhms bezüglich Jes 45,11b vgl. Anm. 16.

(19) In Eph 2,10 wird das Gottesvolk *poiēma Theoy* genannt. Die hebräische Übersetzung von Franz Delitzsch greift hier zu *poʿal<sup>3c</sup> lohîm*.



beiden *p<sup>c</sup>ullā*-Stellen als Gebieter mit seinem Erwerb heim, und in 45,11b fordert er, daß man ihn als Gebieter über das Werk seiner Hände anerkennt.

In Jes 45,11b selbst ist unabhängig von der Frage nach der Satzeinteilung die Wendung *‘al-bānāy* ein Hinweis, daß auch bei *‘al-po‘al yāday* das Volk gemeint ist. In der masoretischen Satzeinteilung, für die wir uns entschieden haben, dürfte *po‘al yāday* eine explikative Funktion haben (“meine Söhne, die das Werk meiner Hände sind”). Auch der vorausgehende Kontext 45,9-11a gibt Aufschluß. Wie “meine Söhne” in 45,10 gleichsam angekündigt wird, so “das Werk meiner Hände” in 45,9. In 45,9a führt nämlich jemand Rechtsstreit mit seinem Bildner (*yošrō*) und in 45,9b sagt der Lehm zu seinem Bildner (*yošrō*): “Was machst du!” Diesem Bildner wird vorgehalten, sein *po‘al* habe keine Hände. Wie immer dies sprachlich zu ordnen ist<sup>(20)</sup>, *po‘al* und verfertigte Hände gehören jedenfalls zusammen, was nach *po‘al yāday* in 45,11b verweist. Ein drittes Mal kommt ein Bildner dann in 45,11a vor. Hier handelt es sich ausdrücklich um den in den deuterocesajanischen Kapiteln so oft genannten *yošer* Israels<sup>(21)</sup>. Da sich alles im Bild von einem mit Lehm arbeitenden Bildner bewegt, kann es sich bei jenem Werk seiner Hände von 45,11b nur um das Volk Israel handeln und nicht etwa um Gottes Heilswirken.

Zu den oben (in Nr. 2) erwähnten Übereinstimmungen zwischen Jes 45,9-13 und 41,21-29 zählte auch das Werk Jahwes und das Werk der Götzen. In 41,24 spricht Jahwe verächtlich zu den Götzen von deren *po‘al*, und in 41,29 konstatiert er: “Nichts ist ihr Werk (*‘aepaes ma<sup>a</sup>šēhaem*)”. Es stellt sich nun die Frage, was man sich unter *po‘al/ma<sup>a</sup>šēhaem* der Götzen vorzustellen hat. Wir könnten uns mit der Feststellung begnügen, daß ihr Werk eben nichts ist; von einem “Volk” der Götzen, analog zum *po‘al yāday* in 45,11b, muß ja nicht unbedingt die Rede sein. Aber die kuriose Wendung in 41,24 lädt zum Weiterfragen ein. Es heißt dort *po‘olkaem me’āpa<sup>c</sup>*. Meist wird die Wendung einem *po‘olkaem me’aepaes* gleichgeachtet, wenn nicht gar auf diese Form gebracht, und dann übersetzt: “Euer Werk ist (weniger als?) nichts”. Man kann verweisen auf *‘aepaes ma<sup>a</sup>šēhaem* in 41,29 sowie auf *me’aepaes* in 40,17. Nun könnte es sich aber bei *me’aepa<sup>c</sup>*, wie *me’āpa<sup>c</sup>* extra pausam lauten würde, um Verfremdung handeln, bei der spielerisch der Terminus *‘aep‘aeh* “Otter” (vgl. Jes 30,6; 59,5; Ijob 20,16) eingeblendet würde<sup>(22)</sup>. Will der Verfasser suggerieren: Euer Werk ist von der Otter, ist Ottergezücht? Dann

<sup>(20)</sup> Vgl. dazu LEENE, “Universalisme”, 311-313.

<sup>(21)</sup> Jahwe als *yošer* Israels noch in Jes 43,1; 44,2; 44,24; 49,5; 64,7; sachlich durchaus auch in der mit 45,9 und 64,7 im Vokabular eng verwandten Stelle Jes 29,16; ferner durch eine finite Verbalform von *yāsar* in 42,6; 43,7; 43, 21; 44,21 und 49,8. Die Stellen 42,6; 49,5 und 49,8 sind hinzuzurechnen, da der Knecht in irgendeiner Form mit Israel identisch ist. Es wird vorausgesetzt, daß der Form *‘aeššorkā* in 42,6 und 49,8 des Verbum *yāsar* zugrundeliegt.

<sup>(22)</sup> Die Handschrift 1QIs<sup>a</sup> bietet in Jes 59,5 *‘p<sup>c</sup> statt ‘p<sup>h</sup>*. Für den Schreiber von 1QIs<sup>a</sup> kann *‘p<sup>c</sup>* demnach wohl “Otter” bedeuten. In den Qumran-Schriften kommt an drei Stellen (1QH II,28; III,12.17-18) *‘aep‘aeh* vor. Die Stelle 1QH III,17 (*ma<sup>a</sup>šē ‘aep‘aeh*) scheint unter dem Einfluß von Jes 41,24 (*po‘olkaem me’āpa<sup>c</sup>*) zu stehen. Es ist allerdings umstritten, ob *‘aep‘aeh* an den drei Qumran-Stellen die Bedeutung “Otter” zukommt. Zur Auslegungsgeschichte von Jes 41,24 vgl. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle*, 293-295, wo mit verfremdender Einblendung der Bedeutung “Otter” gerechnet wird; zu verfremdendem *‘āwaen* (statt *‘ayin*) in Jes 41,29 ebd. 300-301; zu Verfremdungen allgemein ebd. 264-265 (zu Jes 38,11).



wäre *po'al* in 41,24, analog zu *po'al yāday* in 45,11b, die Anhängerschaft, das "Volk" der Götzen. Dem entspräche, daß die Anhängerschaft anschließend in 41,24b als "Greuel" hingestellt wird<sup>(23)</sup>.

##### 5. Nähere Inhaltsbestimmung.

Auch nach den getroffenen Entscheidungen ist die Aussage von Jes 45,11b nicht vollends deutlich. Handelt es sich vielleicht um eine in wohlwollender Ironie ausgesprochene Aufforderung, über den Gott Israels, bei dem alle Macht ist (vgl. 45,12-13) zu verfügen? Im vorausgehenden Kontext (45,9-10) wird ein solches Ansinnen zwar als absurd hingestellt; aber das könnte die ironische Aufforderung geradezu vorbereiten wollen. Die erste Satzhälfte von 45,11b würde also besagen: "Über die künftigen Ereignisse stellt mich nur ruhig zur Rede". Das Verbum *šā'al* "fragen" kann die hier vorausgesetzte Bedeutung annehmen<sup>(24)</sup>. Die zweite Satzhälfte würde hinzufügen: "Gebt mir die Befehlsgewalt über meine Söhne, das Werk meiner Hände".

Den Vorzug verdient jedoch eine Inhaltsbestimmung, die sich folgendermaßen paraphrasieren läßt: Ihr, die ihr unbefugt und zu nichts imstande seid (vgl. 45,9-10), ihr habt, was die kommenden Dinge betrifft, keine andere Wahl, als sie bei mir zu erfragen; denn niemand außer mir vermag das Kommende vorherzusagen<sup>(25)</sup>; ferner müßt ihr es mir überlassen, über mein Volk zu gebieten, denn ich allein verfüge über alle Macht, mit der ich unter anderem den Kyrus erwecke (vgl. 45,12-13)<sup>(26)</sup>.

Dem Verbum *šā'al* kommt also in 45,11b nicht etwa die Bedeutung "zur Rede stellen" zu; es hat vielmehr in der normalen Bedeutung "erfragen, sich erkundigen" seine Funktion im Rahmen der Vorhersagethematik<sup>(27)</sup>. In gleicher Bedeutung und Funktion kommt *šā'al* auch in 41,28 vor, bezeichnenderweise in dem mit 45,9-13 inhaltlich verwandten Abschnitt 41,21-29, wo vor allem noch die kommenden Dinge und die Erweckung des Kyrus zur Sprache kommen<sup>(28)</sup>. In 41,28 stellt Jahwe fest, daß er keine

<sup>(23)</sup> In *yibḥar bākaem*, von *tô'ebâ* durch den Akzent *ṭifhâ* getrennt, haben wir einen asyndetischen Relativsatz, der als Subjekt des Satzes fungiert. Zu übersetzen ist also: "Ein Greuel ist, wer euch erwählt". Weniger wahrscheinlich ist die Textauffassung: "Einen Greuel erwählt man in euch".

<sup>(24)</sup> Vgl. Dtn 13,15 ("gerichtlich befragen, verhören") und Ps 35,11 ("anklagen, bezichtigen"). Recht geläufig ist die Bedeutung "verhören" beim aramäischen *š'el* (im Passiv) in außerbiblischen Texten; vgl. E. VOGT, *Lexicon linguae aramaicae Veteris Testamenti documentis antiquis illustratum* (Roma 1971) s.v. Zum akkadischen *ša'alû* vgl. TH. H. GASTER, "Short Notes", VT 4 (1954) 73, wo mit dem Blick auf Ps 35,11 ein einschlägiger Beleg angeführt wird.

<sup>(25)</sup> Vgl. die Angaben in Anm. 5. Daß sie das Kommende nicht vorhersagen können, wird nicht nur den Völkern und ihren Götzen vorgehalten sondern auch Israel, implizit in 42,9; 43,12; 44,8 und 46,10-12 sowie ganz deutlich in 48,1-16.

<sup>(26)</sup> Die Übersetzung von BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle*, 342 ("Vous pouvez m'interroger sur l'avenir, mais, pour ce qui est du sort de mes fils et de l'ouvrage de mes mains, laissez m'en la charge") ist insofern zu beanstanden, als sie die erste Vershälfte im Gegensatz zur zweiten als Konzession hinstellt.

<sup>(27)</sup> LEENE, "Universalisme", 330, meint zu Unrecht, daß der Aspekt der Vorhersage in 45,9-13 fehlt.

<sup>(28)</sup> Vgl. Nr. 2 sowie Nr. 4, gegen Ende.

Antwort von "diesen" (= den Götzen) erhalten würde, wenn er sie nach Zukünftigem fragen würde.

#### 6. Wer wird in Jes 45,11b angesprochen?

Die Mehrheit der Autoren dürfte sich für das Volk Israel entscheiden. Nach anderen sind es die Heidenvölker, die angesprochen werden<sup>(29)</sup>. Die soeben vorgeschlagene nähere Inhaltsbestimmung ist an sich mit beiden Auffassungen vereinbar.

Der Verfasser ("Deuteriojesaja") ist äußerst flexibel, was Sprecher und Sprechrichtung betrifft. Es scheint ihm manchmal nicht darauf anzukommen, wer da zu wem spricht, wenn nur seine Botschaft zum Leser gelangt. Dennoch dürfte es genügend Hinweise dafür geben, daß in Jes 45,11b Israel angesprochen wird.

Dem braucht nicht entgegenzustehen, daß der Gott Israels in einer an Israel gerichteten Rede von seinem Volk wie von einem Dritten spricht, nämlich von "meinen Söhnen" und vom "Werk meiner Hände", wie er im unmittelbaren Kontext ja auch von "meiner Stadt" und "meinen Verbannten" spricht (vgl. 45,13b). Es gibt genügend vergleichbare Stellen, an denen die Sprechrichtung deutlich ist<sup>(30)</sup>.

Der größere auf 45,9-13 folgende Zusammenhang von 45,14-25 spricht dafür, daß 45,11b-13 an Israel gerichtet ist. In 45, 14-17 wird, wohl unter dem Einfluß von *ʿrî* "meine Stadt" in 45,13, mit femininem Suffix der 2. Person des Singulars ein Adressat angesprochen, bei dem es sich nur um Zion handeln kann. In 45,17 ist von Israel in der 3. Person die Rede, es wird jedoch im selben Vers in der 2. Person des Plurals angesprochen. Erst von 45,20 an wird sporadisch ein Wort an die Völker gerichtet, wobei die Sprechrichtung schwankend bleibt. Insgesamt spricht der Großabschnitt 45,14-25 nicht für die Annahme, daß 45,9-13 an die Völker gerichtet ist<sup>(31)</sup>.

Wie sollte auch der in 45,11a vorgestellte *yöser* Israels, der in der Bildsprache von 45,9 bereits zweimal vorkam, das Wort nicht an sein Gebilde (*poʿal*) richten? Es kommt hinzu, daß immer Israel der Adressat ist, wenn wie in 45,11 in der einleitenden Botenformel der Titel *yöser* (Israels) erscheint. So in 43,1; 44,2; 44,24 und 49,5<sup>(32)</sup>. Leene<sup>(33)</sup> macht dagegen geltend, daß Jahwe sich in den Botenformeln von 43,1; 44,2 und 44,24 dem Volk Israel als "dein Bildner" vorstelle und somit kein Zweifel bestehe, daß die folgende Rede an Israel gerichtet sei. Ebenso eindeutig sei die Sprechrichtung, wenn die Botenformel wie in 43,14; 48,17 und 54,8.10 einen anderen Titel enthält, der mit dem Suffix der 2. Person versehen ist. In 45,11 dagegen stehe *yösrô* "sein

<sup>(29)</sup> So nachdrücklich LEENE, "Universalisme".

<sup>(30)</sup> Vgl. u.a. Jes 43, 20b-24; 45,19; 46,13; 48,1-2; 49,7; 51,16; 52,3-4; 54,17. Gott kann von sich selbst wie von einem Dritten sprechen (vgl. etwa 41,16.20).

<sup>(31)</sup> Gegen LEENE, "Universalisme". Der Verfasser betont mit Recht die Verbundenheit von 45,9-13 und 45,14-17 (324-328), scheint aber nicht zu empfinden, daß dies gegen seine These spricht, die 45,9-13 an die Völker gerichtet sein läßt. Er spricht nur von "a certain inconsequence, a certain tension" (328).

<sup>(32)</sup> In 49,5 ist es der Knecht Israel, der von "meinem Bildner (*yösrî*)" spricht und ihn redend einführt.

<sup>(33)</sup> LEENE, "Universalisme", 321.

Bildner” mit dem Suffix der 3. Person. Dieser Argumentation ist entgegenzuhalten, daß immerhin in 44,6 ein an Israel gerichtetes Wort mit einer Botenformel eingeführt wird, die sehr wohl einen mit dem Suffix der 3. Person versehenen Titel enthält (“der König von Israel und sein Erlöser”)<sup>(34)</sup>. Ferner wird in 49,7 ein an den Jahweknecht Israel gerichtetes Wort mit einer Botenformel eingeführt, die von Israel in der 3. Person spricht. Daß der biblische Verfasser in 44,6 und 45,11 das Suffix der 3. Person gebraucht, hat einen simplen sprachlichen Grund. In diesen beiden Fällen schließt sich der suffigierte Titel mit einem *Waw copulativum* an einen anderen vorausgehenden Titel an.

Johannesstraße 36a  
D-56112 Lahnstein

Joachim BECKER

#### SUMMARY

In Isa 45,11b no conjecture may be preferred to masoretic *šēʾālûnî* and *hāʾotiyyôṭ*, and the masoretic division of the sentence should be maintained. Special attention is paid to a comparison of Isa 45,9-13 with 41,21-29 and to the meaning of *šiwwâ ʿal* and *poʿal yāday*. The sentence may be translated as follows: “For the future things ask me, the leading of my sons, which are the work of my hands, commit to me”. The sentence seems to be addressed to the people of Israel.

<sup>(34)</sup> Leene sucht dieses Gegenargument mit dem Hinweis zu entkräften, daß 44,6-8 an eine “much wider audience” gerichtet sei.

## Christ is the Parade: A Comparative Study of the Triumphal Procession in 2 Cor 2,14 and Col 2,15

In revisiting the two New Testament occurrences of the verb θριαμβεύειν, namely 2 Cor 2,14b and Col 2,15b, this essay will not go over again the diverse etymological and historical fine points of the word's lexical meaning, as they have been thrashed out *longe lateque* in dictionaries, commentaries and articles.

Instead, because other authors have previously looked at both passages in completely separately from each other, not one of them ever having weighed the two occurrences one against another, the purpose of the present study will be to fill in that *lacuna*, and compare 2 Cor 2,14 and Col 2,15 in the quest to clarify the meaning of θριαμβεύειν.

Methodically, this comparison calls for the discussion of four syntactic features: First, we will scrutinize the similarity and dissimilarities contained in the respective expressions ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (2 Cor 2,14), and ἐν αὐτῷ (Col 2,15). Second, we will inspect the relevance of the fact that in both cases a participle is dependent upon a finite verb. Third, how do we identify the persons represented by the personal pronouns ἡμᾶς in 2 Cor, and αὐτοὺς in Col? Lastly, who is who in that triumphal parade? Let us begin, then, by taking a closer look at the preposition ἐν in both passages.

### 1. “In Christ/Him”, Similarities and Dissimilarities

The two passages we are looking at are 2 Cor 2,14a Τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (NVg: *Deo autem gratias, qui semper triumphat nos in Christo*)<sup>(1)</sup> and Col 2,15b θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ. NVg: *triumphans illos in semetipso*)<sup>(2)</sup>. Greek variant readings that would affect the interpretation of the syntagmas do not exist.

#### a) The preposition ἐν

One of the two similarities between the two syntagmas resides in the preposition ἐν “in”: In discussing θριαμβεύειν authors have, with surprising unanimity, failed to observe the relationship of the indirect object (i.e., the apostles in 2 Cor, and the angels in Col) with Christ<sup>(3)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> The NRS translates: “But thanks be to God, who in Christ always leads us in triumphal procession”; the Jerusalem Bible, by comparison, has this rendition: “Thanks be to God who, wherever he goes, makes us, in Christ, partners of his triumph”.

<sup>(2)</sup> Again, the NRS reads: “triumphing over them in it”; and the Jerusalem Bible translates: “and paraded them in public, behind him in his triumphal procession”.

<sup>(3)</sup> In this sense W. REES, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, CCHS, 886l, dissociates Christ from the apostles: “‘Leads us (as captives) in His triumphal procession’; a daring image: God’s conquering love seems almost to overstretch human capacity and to drag His apostles after him”.

Both sentences are alike also in their phrasing: the respective participle is followed first by the accusative pronoun of the direct object “us” (apostles) and “them” (sovereignities and powers), then by a preposition referring to Christ, and finally by the dative of the indirect object (τῷ Χριστῷ in 2 Cor, αὐτῷ in Col). Let us take a closer look at both instances, beginning with 2 Cor: God the Father parades the apostles “in Christ”, ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. Paul emphasizes Christ in whom the apostles find themselves rooted<sup>(4)</sup>. Similarly in Col, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ, the angels are paraded in Christ, the One who is last mentioned in v. 11 as the subject.

Thus, in both verses the location of the triumph is indicated with the identical preposition ἐν “in”. Again, the indirect object of “in” is Christ<sup>(5)</sup>. In both instances, therefore, the verb is used transitively<sup>(6)</sup>: “God/Christ” leads “us/them” in triumph. If the verb were without the object (“us/”/“them”), then it would intransitively mean: “Christ triumphs”, He would be the ‘triumphator’. Moreover, although the preposition highlights the objects of God’s/Christ’s triumph, by its very nature it transitions back into Christ. He is the main agent, and the parade is effected in Himself<sup>(7)</sup>.

Syntactically speaking, the combination of θριαμβεύειν and the preposition ἐν is not known in secular literature; it is a unique facet of Pauline grammar<sup>(8)</sup>. For a triumphal parade to be located “in” someone, one has to

(4) J.J. O’ROURKE, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*, JBC, 52:12, points out the union of Christ’s Body: “As a victorious general heads his triumphal march, so God manifests His power throughout the world through the works of the apostles who are united to Christ, through whom God has brought salvation. This union of the apostles and other Christians to Christ — whose members we are elsewhere said to be (Col 1,24) — is a central theme of Paul’s teaching”.

(5) In contrast to L. WILLIAMSON, “Led in Triumph. Paul’s Use of *Thriambeuo*”, *Int* 22 (1968) 326, who refers ἐν αὐτῷ in Col 2,15 to the cross (see 2,14) rather than to Christ, translating the verse: “Having stripped the powers and authorities he made a public example of them, exposing them to ridicule (θριαμβεύσας) on the cross”. Likewise, C.J. CALLAN, *The Epistles of St. Paul* (New York 1951) 171, claims the pronoun points to the cross.

(6) F. BLASS – A. DEBRUNNER, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago – London 1961) 148, § 1.

(7) M.J. HARRIS, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Grand Rapids 2005) 248, alludes to that centrality of Christ: “In this frontispiece to Paul’s apologetic description of the apostolic ministry (2:14–7:4), three main emphases are discernible: (1) Paul recognized the apostolic ministry to be God’s ministry through the apostles. From first to last, always and everywhere, it is God who acts, leading his willing captives in his victory pageant and disseminating the fragrant knowledge of Christ through those same triumphant captives. (2) The focal point of this divine operation is Christ. The privilege of participating in God’s triumph is accorded in and through Christ, and it is the knowledge of Christ, a sweet aroma, that is diffused during that triumphal procession. (3) God’s activity, focused in Christ, is ongoing and universal, without temporal or national boundaries. God’s triumph is always and everywhere”.

(8) Suffice it here to cite three sources by way of reminder: (I) G. DELLING, “θριαμβεύω”, *TDNT*, III, 159-160: “To triumph over (ἀπό κατά τινός ἐπὶ τινί)”; (II) F. ZORELL, *Lexicon Graecum Novi Testamenti* (Rome 1990) 595: “(1) intransitive: *triumphum* ago; (2) transitive: *alqm. triumpho*, i.e. (a) *victim in triumpho circumduco*, aut (b) *universim, plane devinco*, ita sec. multos Col 2,15; (c) 2 Cor 2,14 *Deus apostolos θριαμβεύειν dicitur*, i.e. *aut triumphare facere* (cf. μαθητεύειν discere et docere), *aut spectandos circumducere ad suam gloriam*”; (III) H.G. LIDDELL – R. SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford 1968) 806: “(i) triumph over; (ii) lead in triumph, of conquered enemies, Col 2,15; lead in triumph, as a general does his army, metaph. 2 Cor 2,14”.

imagine something that transcends the laws of nature. In the ultimate analysis, the tenor of the phrase really circumscribes a mystery.

Here are a selected few of the numerous instances of the common and ubiquitous “in Christ”—expressions in Paul, making it unambiguous that the person is seen as living and acting in intimate oneness with Christ: Rom 6,11 (ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ); 8,1 (οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ); 1 Cor 15,22 (οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιήθησονται); 2 Cor 5,17 (ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις); Gal 3,28 (πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ); Eph 2,10 (κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ); Phil 1,1 (Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος δούλοι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ); 1 Thess 4,16 (οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον); 2 Tim 3,12 (καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ θέλοντες εὐσεβῶς ζῆν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διωχθήσονται); Phlm 1,23 (Ἀσπάζεται σε Ἐπαφρᾶς ὁ συναιχμαλώτός μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ).

The sacred author clearly intends a personal union with Christ that goes beyond simple knowledge or spiritual closeness. Therefore, the dissociation of the apostles/angels from Christ has caused expositors to seek the “place” of the apostles/angels in the parade. This author contends that if one accepts the reality of personal union with Christ, then the apostles/angels take the same place as Christ in the parade<sup>(9)</sup>.

#### b) “God the Father in Christ” as the subject

The first of three differences between the verses discussed resides in the circumstance that the subject of triumph in 2 Cor is “God the Father in Christ”, whereas in Col it is “Christ in Himself”<sup>(10)</sup>. Paul, therefore, accentuates the first divine person in 2 Cor, while in Col the spotlight is on Christ, even though God the Father is referred to as the cause of the Son’s resurrection in Col 2,12. As a consequence, we find the Father’s absolute patronage of the parades entrenched in the context: (a) In 2 Cor, God the Father parades the apostles in Christ; (b) In Col, on the contrary, it is Christ who parades the angels in Himself.

Another notable difference, of course, is that in 2 Cor an apparently unspecified “us” is the object of triumphal parading, whereas in Col they are the “sovereignities and authorities”. At this point it is sufficient to realize that both phrases deal with plural entities of persons. We will have to address the identification of both groups in point four of this treatise.

A third and last difference involves the choice of tenses. In 2 Cor the sacred writer employs the present tense of the participle in a context laden with present tense verbs. He conveys the impression of an enduring gratitude to God, accompanied by the ongoing parading in Christ. In Col, by contrast, the aorist tense is employed in harmony with the preponderantly aoristic context. Greek Grammars demonstrate that the aorist highlights the factuality

<sup>(9)</sup> J. MURPHY-O’CONNOR, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*, NJBC, 50:13, seems to prioritize the concept of motion over the idea of union: “From the much-discussed verb *thriambeuein*, which connotes a Roman triumph, Paul retains only the idea of motion in complete dependence on a higher authority”.

<sup>(10)</sup> The divine authorship of the triumph is underscored by the active voice of θριαμβεύοντι and θριαμβεύσας.

of the action envisaged, rather than situating the action within a time horizon. Accordingly, the tense discrepancy in both phrases does not in any way lessen the actuality of the triumph in Christ.

At this point we need to turn to a consideration of the syntactic placement of the respective participles in 2 Cor and Col.

## 2. *The participle is subordinate to the finite verb*

Paul is fond of continuing a construction begun with a finite verb by means of co-ordinated participles, sometimes strung out in a long series<sup>(11)</sup>. One of the features of the participle is that it can express syntactic subordination to the main verb. Along those lines one might say that if the main finite verb of the proximate context has a positive tone then the participles coordinated or subordinated should also be interpreted in a positive way. With this in mind let us examine the relationships between finite verb and participles in 2 Cor and Col.

In 2 Cor 2,14a, the present active dative masculine singular participle *θριαμβεύοντι* is subordinate to the implied verb “I give” in Paul’s gratitude to God: “I give thanks to God”, or “thanks be given to God”. The participle, therefore, expounds on that positive sentiment of thankfulness to God<sup>(12)</sup>. It should not be understood as depicting the apostles as captives in that triumphal parade<sup>(13)</sup>. This conclusion can be further substantiated by taking into account the positive image of sweet fragrance spread everywhere in v. 14b<sup>(14)</sup>. The participle *θριαμβεύοντι* qualifies the noun “God” to whom Paul gives thanks, without any explicit finite verb. Paul is grateful to God who leads him in triumph, therefore. The gratitude sheds a positive light on his entire statement<sup>(15)</sup>.

<sup>(11)</sup> Cf. BLASS – DEBRUNNER, *Grammar*, 468.

<sup>(12)</sup> It is striking that the NVg fails to translate this participle; instead, it renders it with the finite verb “triumphat”.

<sup>(13)</sup> Contrary to F. MATERA, *II Corinthians*. A Commentary (The New Testament Library, Louisville – London 2003) 70, who arrives at a negative understanding of the metaphor by combining three notions: enmity, captivity, and sacrificial fragrance: “Paul is certainly aware of being God’s enemy: 1Cor 9:16; 15:9. [...] By employing the metaphor of the triumphal procession, Paul presents God as the conquering general and himself as God’s prisoner. Like a captive in a triumphal procession, Paul faces suffering and perhaps even death because of the ministry he exercises. [...] The metaphor should be understood in light of the sacrificial imagery of the OT since ‘fragrance’ and ‘odor’ are frequently combined in the Greek OT to describe the sweet-smelling fragrance of sacrifice”.

<sup>(14)</sup> HARRIS, *Corinthians*, 246, expounds this point: “Since *φανεροῦντι* is coordinate with *θριαμβεύοντι*, both being present participles describing God’s continuous action, it is fair to assume that the ‘odor’ should be understood against the same background as v. 14a, the Roman triumph. Such an assumption seems justified by the presence of *ὄσμη*, (odor, fragrance), for included in the victory procession — at least on occasion — were those who burned incense along the route, others who carried and displayed spices brought from the conquered regions, and yet others who scattered garlands of flowers and sprinkled perfume along the streets. As a result, pleasant fragrances filled the air and were widely diffused along the processional route. See also the use of aromatic substances in epiphany processions in the Greco-Roman world to announce to the spectators the approach of the deity. Hence, Paul depicts himself as the fragrance or harbinger of God’s presence because it is through him that the knowledge of God is made known”.

<sup>(15)</sup> J. LAMBRECHT, *Second Corinthians* (Sacra Pagina Series 8, Collegeville 1999) 38, signals an exception among Biblicists in that he perceives some of the positive tenor: “A



Col 2,15b is the syntactic finale of a long sentence beginning in v. 11. Contextually speaking, the noun ἀπεκδύσει in v.11 prepares the way for the verb ἀπεκδυσάμενος in v. 15a: “to put off, to discard” the body of carnal circumcision in the circumcision of Christ. There are three finite verbs in the preceding context interspersed with subordinated participles: (a) the aorist συνεζωοποίησεν (“to make alive together with”) in v. 13, followed by five aorist participles in vv. 13b-15 (χαρισάμενος, ἐξαλείψας, προσηλώσας, ἀπεκδυσάμενος, and θριαμβεύσας); (b) the perfect tense ἤρκεν (“took away”) in v. 14b as referring to Christ’s action of nailing the record of our debt to the cross; (c) and lastly the finite aorist ἐδειγμάτισεν in v. 15a that dominates the aorist participle θριαμβεύσας.

A clearer grasp of θριαμβεύσας in Col 2,15b necessitates a correct perception of the meaning of the two verbs found in 2,15a, ἀπεκδυσάμενος and ἐδειγμάτισεν. The former, unlike its use in 2,11 and 3,9 where it qualifies human salvation, is here applied to the angelic nature. Christ is seen as despoiling the Sovereignities and Powers. This image and act of spoliation can only refer to their very sovereignty and power in view of their submissive inclusion in the Sovereign’s parade. Thus, the disarmament of their hitherto seemingly unchecked dominion and authority only readies them for an existence of dependency and obedience under the rule of Christ’s headship. Biblicists have generally interpreted this image in a negative sense based on the understanding of “sovereignities and powers” as diabolical spirits. Our reading of this is rather positive in light of the identification of those spirits as angels, as we will explain in the upcoming chapter three of this essay.

Turning then to the verb ἐδειγμάτισεν, we take into account that it is being translated by the NVg as “traduxit” (“he led along, he led across, he displayed”); the addition ἐν παρρησίᾳ is rendered with “confidently” (“confidently, freely, boldly, publicly”)<sup>(16)</sup>. We choose to take this positive rendition of both words as an invitation not to be overly influenced by the negative nuance of the only other occurrence of δειγματίζω in the New Testament, that is, in Mat 1,19. Therefore, the exegesis of 2,15 would flow into the following paraphrase: “Christ, by disarming the angels of their unchecked independence and authority, leads them proudly along, parading them in Himself”. Since ἐδειγμάτισεν is a finite verb, the two participles of v. 15 are mere qualifiers of the action of public display.

Verse 14 seems to frame Paul’s portrayal of salvation in Christ and man’s participation in it begun in v. 11, asserting the obliteration of human guilt through the reality of the cross (ἐξαλείψας). Passing over into v. 15, Paul expands his vision beyond humanity and illustrates how our “convivification” (v. 13b συνεζωοποίησεν) eventually involves the general acquiescence of

---

triumphal procession is metaphorically not strictly limited to the military parade. In the Greco-Roman world it was also used for the epiphany procession of a deity. Paul’s own use of *thriambeuō* takes this broadening of sense into account [...] presenting himself not as a captured prisoner led in that procession but as a conquered missionary apostolically driven by God”.

<sup>(16)</sup> A fairly common noun in the Johannine and Pauline writings, as well as in the Acts of the Apostles, *παρρησία* always conveys a positive sense of frankness in the acceptance and proclamation of God’s salvation.

angelic spirits under the divine rule. Verse 15, therefore, rounds out the author's depiction of Christ's cosmically victorious work of liberation. It is in this light that the writer's recourse to the parade metaphor has to be contemplated.

Coming back to the above-mentioned three finite verbs of the context, we infer that the tenor of the finite verbs is positive, as it articulates the salvation wrought by Christ. All of the actions described in those finite verbs and participles are the actions of Christ, and they all portray our definitive liberation. Christ as the author of that redemption appears as the subject of the entire phrase in vv. 8.11. It may be argued that the verb συνεζωοποίησεν is central to the train of thought of vv. 11-15. Not least for that reason the evaluation of θριαμβεύσας should reflect the positive context. Christ parades the disarmed Sovereignities and Powers in Himself.

Before we examine the function of the triumph and the relationship between Christ and those paraded in Him, we will take a moment to explore the identity of the respective objects of triumph in 2 Cor and Col.

### 3. Identity of "us" and "them"

Prior to reaching some conclusions regarding the arrangement of the triumphal parade, the issue of identity has to be addressed: who is who in that triumph? To whom does Paul actually refer by using the plurals ἡμᾶς in 2 Cor and αὐτούς in Col?

Let us first take a look at the pronoun "us" in 2 Cor. From 1,1 we learn that the senders of that letter are Paul and Timothy. In 1,4-14 the "we/us" of the ministers (Paul and Timothy) consistently contrasts with the "you/your" pointing to the Christians at Corinth as the addressees. Then, in 1,15 Paul begins to speak in the first person; and in 1,19 he makes it quite plain who the "us" is: himself, Timothy and Silvanus. 1,23-2,13 is a section where the apostle writes again in the first person. It is in 2,14 that he mentions "us" again, undoubtedly the three persons mentioned in 1,19, in antithesis with the beneficiaries of his ministry, that is, "those who are being saved and for those who are not", 2,15. Hence, the "us" in 2,14 indicates in the first place the three persons mentioned in 1,19. It seems appropriate, however, to connect this plural also with Paul's friend Titus referred to in 2,13, and through him with all the apostolic ministers on every level of the early Church. Those evangelizers are seen as rooted in Christ as He is being paraded by God the Father. Again, God the Father is the main agent of that triumph. He is followed by Christ; enclosed in Christ are Paul and his co-workers<sup>(17)</sup>.

Turning to Col now, we have to ask the same question: who exactly are the objects of Christ's parade: who is "them"? After having cited in v. 10b the singular of πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, the sacred writer reintroduces them at

<sup>(17)</sup> HARRIS, *Corinthians*, 247, observes the noteworthy move from ἡμᾶς, v. 14a, to ἡμῶν, v. 14b: Paul, the passive captive, is also the active evangelist; these two are united in his picturesque self-description. God's power is displayed in the midst of human weakness, a reality permeating 2 Cor (see the paradoxical image: "ambassador in chains" Eph 6,20).

the beginning of v. 15 as a plural entity: τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, “the Sovereignities and Powers” (see 1,16). Are they the good or the fallen angels<sup>(18)</sup>? Of particular relevance is Col 2,10 where Paul underlines Christ’s headship over all angelic powers (v. 10b, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας), presumably both good and fallen angels<sup>(19)</sup>. Noticeable also is the link between man and angel in v. 10a (καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι): the propinquity of human beings and angels in one verse might suggest that the author had the faithful spirits in mind. In 1,13 he contrasts the ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκοτοῦς, “powers of darkness”, arguably the diabolical spirits, with the ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας in 1,16 and 2,10. The latter in all likelihood represent the angelic hierarchies<sup>(20)</sup>. In our view, therefore, the “Sovereignities and Powers” of 2,15 are primarily the angels, and not demons<sup>(21)</sup>.

#### 4. Who is Who in the parade?

There are, therefore, three principal reasons that favor a positive interpretation of the triumph in 2 Cor and Col: (a) the subjects paraded are found “in Christ”, (b) the literary context is positive, (c) the subjects are human and angelic evangelizers. With this in mind we will now attempt to

<sup>(18)</sup> ZORELL, *Lexicon*, affirms that Paul had the good angels in mind: “per metonymiam ἐξουσίας dicitur ... angelorum quidam ordo; Potestates: plur. E 3:10. C 1:16; 2:15. 1P 3:22; se lapsis angelis Eph 6:12” (459); “ἀρχαὶς vocantur quidam angeli principatus, Col 1:16; 2:15; etiam lapsi, Rom 8:38” (178); “Col 2:15 moriens se exiit sc. Corpore. Mea actione seu potentia exuo ac plane spolio alqm: Deus angelicas potestates in Christi morte” (139). J.D. DUNN, *The Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids 1996) 166-170, and A. von SPEYR, *The Letter to the Colossians* (San Francisco 1993) 93-94, are undecided about their identity.

<sup>(19)</sup> CALLAN, *Epistles*, 171, opts for the demons: “He triumphed over the hostile powers that had held man captive. [...] ‘Principalities and powers’, these two terms are used above (1:16; 2:10) in a favorable sense for good angels, but here they are taken in an evil sense for demons, as in Eph 6:12”. J. MURPHY-O’CONNOR, *Colossians, NCCHS*, 914h, are in accord with Callan: “The dying Jesus like a king divests Himself of that ‘flesh’ which is the tool and medium of the powers of evil, thus reducing them to impotence”.

<sup>(20)</sup> A literary device known as *pars pro toto*.

<sup>(21)</sup> Agreeing with D.J. LEAHY, *The Epistle to the Colossians, CCHS*, 912c: “Having stripped the angels God exposes them ‘in public’ in the triumphal procession”. See also *St. Paul’s Captivity Epistles, NaBi*, 178: “The angelic principalities and powers are insignificant by comparison with Him [Christ]: God has overpowered them and publicly exposed them through the death of His Son”. Likewise J.A. GRASSI, *The Letter to the Colossians, JBC*, 55:25: “The ruling angelic powers were believed to have control over material things; Christ, by putting aside His material body, was able to escape their control and triumph over them. [...] They are henceforth under His command (2:10) and have no power to harm or control believers”. See also M.P. HORGAN, *The Letter to the Colossians, NJBC*, 54:20.

<sup>(22)</sup> T. O’CURRAOIN, *2 Corinthians, NCCHS*, 889g, maintain that “the thought of the result (work in Corinth) overwhelms him [Paul] with gratitude to God who, like an emperor in a Roman procession ‘leads’ the apostles like captives ‘around in his triumph’; like captives they are publicly exposed ‘in the Christ’”. M.E. THRALL, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (ICC; Cambridge 1965) I, 195: “Whatever the exegetical difficulties, it is surely right to understand the verb in its usual, attested sense when followed by a direct object, ‘lead (as a conquered prisoner) in a triumphal procession’”. See also P. BARNETT, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids – Cambridge 1997); and P. DUFF, “Metaphor, Motif, and Meaning: The Rhetorical Strategy behind the Image ‘Led in Triumph’ in 2 Corinthians 2:14”, *CBQ* 53 (1991) 79-92; C. BREYTENBACH, “Paul’s Proclamation and God’s ‘THRIAMBOS’. Notes on 2 Corinthians 2:14-16b”, *Neot* 24,2

analyze the order of the parade, challenging the common opinion of commentators that Paul understood the apostles/angels to be the captives<sup>(22)</sup>.

The following is a sketch of the historical arrangement of a Roman Triumphus: at the head of this ostentatious pageant came the magistrates and the senate, who were followed by trumpeters and some spoils of war. Then came the flute players, ahead of white oxen to be sacrificed in the temples, along with some representative captives from the conquered territory, including such dignitaries as the king, driven in chains in front of the ornate chariot of the general, the 'triumphator' (the one honored by the triumph), who wore the garb of Jupiter and carried a scepter in his left hand. A slave held a crown over his head whispering into his ear "memento te hominem" ("Remember you are human"). The victorious army followed, shouting "Io, triumphe!" ("Hail, triumphant one!"). As the procession ascended the Capitoline Hill, some of the leading captives (usually royal figures or the tallest and strongest of the conquered warriors) were taken aside into the nearby prison and executed. Sacrifices were offered upon arrival at the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. Twofold was the purpose of a triumph: to thank the gods who had guaranteed the victory and to glorify the valor of the triumphator<sup>(23)</sup>.

Based on the findings above, we propose the following identification of the objects of triumph in such a traditional parade: the apostles would take the place of senators and magistrates preceding the general, that is, Christ, while the angels follow Him in metaphorical association with the army in marching order. Paul's modified appropriation of the image, however, implies that both groups are integrated in Christ. The entire parade consists "in Christ"<sup>(24)</sup>. This assumes a deeper meaning when contemplated in the light of Paul's theology about the Church as Christ's Body, propounded in Col 1,18.

Also, the context of fragrance in 2 Cor 2,14-16<sup>(25)</sup> urges the reader to understand the metaphor positively: the ministers and angels triumph with

---

(1990) 257-271; S. HAFEMANN, *Suffering and the Spirit*. An Exegetical Study of II Cor 2:14-3:3 within the Context of the Corinthian Correspondence (WUNT II/19, Tübingen 1986); P. MARSHALL, "A Metaphor of Social Shame: *thriambeuein* in 2Cor 2:14", *NT* 25 (1983) 302-317.

<sup>(22)</sup> Cf. HARRIS, *Corinthians*, 240; see also *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language* (Springfield 1944) 2718; *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford 1933) XI, 386; *The Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford 1982) 1979; *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (Farmington Hills 2003) XIV, 209.

<sup>(24)</sup> *St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians*, NaBi, 177 also underline the union that exists between the subject and the objects of the parade: "God passes through the world in triumph by means of the Gospel, associating the Apostles with his progress".

<sup>(25)</sup> No less than four times in three verses: v. 14 τὴν ὁσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντί τόπῳ; v. 15 Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἔσμεν τῷ θεῷ; and v. 16 οἷς μὲν ὁσμὴ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὁσμὴ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν.

<sup>(26)</sup> Hereby we fundamentally disagree with HARRIS, *Corinthians*, 247, who identifies them as captives. Harris mirrors the opinion of the vast majority of scholars: "In a similar way, Col 2:15 says that God first disarmed (ἀπεκδυσάμενος) the powers and authorities and then boldly displayed them in public (ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ) by leading them, as already defeated enemies, in triumphal procession through Christ (θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ). They were driven, as it were, before the victor's chariot as silent testimony to the superior might of their conqueror. [...] they are involuntary, sullen captives and silent witnesses to the commander's conquest".

God in Christ! They are sharers in His victory<sup>(26)</sup>. Consequently, it is quite implausible to identify the ministers and angels with the captives, or else with the white bull destined for sacrifice, or even with the general himself. Christ is the general who after defeating the reign of darkness allows apostles and angels to partake in the glory of His victory<sup>(27)</sup>.

After having reflected on the last of the four syntactic features as indicated in the introduction let us now draw the threads together.

\*  
\* \*

This essay was intended to reaffirm the methodological indispensability of comparing infrequently used biblical terms with corresponding occurrences in the Scripture. Diverse ways of considering the parallel Greek expressions in 2 Cor 2,14a and Col 2,15b were meant to aid in the verification of a parallelism of the *Sitz im Leben*. So, let us then reiterate the basic arguments concerning the positive connotation of θριαμβεύειν, thereby arriving at our conclusion.

By scrutinizing the similarity and dissimilarities contained in the expressions ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ in 2 Cor, and ἐν αὐτῷ in Col, we found that Paul intended a substantial union of the apostles and angels with Christ that goes beyond simple knowledge or spiritual closeness. We concluded that the separation of the apostles from Christ caused commentators to seek the “place” of the apostles/angels in the triumphal parade. Yet, if one accepts the above-mentioned personal union with Christ then the apostles/angels take the same place as Christ in the parade.

In both phrases we are dealing with a participle dependent on a finite verb. Our claim was that if the main finite verb of the proximate context has a positive tone, then the participles coordinate or subordinate to it should also be interpreted in a positive way. Now, since the participle in 2 Cor echoes the sentiment of thankfulness to God, its context cannot be understood as identifying the apostles with the captives in that triumphal parade. This opinion was then corroborated by taking into account the positive image of sweet fragrance spread everywhere in v. 14b. Likewise, in Col the verb ‘convivificare’ was found central to the tenets of vv. 11-15. We judged, therefore, that the interpretation of θριαμβεύσας should reflect that positivity: Christ parades the angels in Himself.

In seeking to identify the individuals behind the pronoun ἡμᾶς in 2 Cor we gathered that it referred to the three persons mentioned in 2 Cor 1,19. It appeared fitting, however, to correlate this plural also with Paul’s friend Titus spoken of in 2,13, and through him with all the apostles and their co-workers of the early Church. Regarding the pronoun αὐτοῦς in Col, we contended that Paul had primarily the angels in mind.

Our goal then was to comprehend “who is who” in that triumphal parade. We conjectured the apostles as featuring in the place of senators and

<sup>(27)</sup> In accord with the connotations of the actual triumph: pomp, joyful public celebration, festivity and exultation of victory/success, elation, rapturous delight, and victory, cf. *The Oxford English Dictionary*, XI, 386.

magistrates preceding the general, that is, Christ, while the angels would follow Him in metaphorical association with the army in marching order. At that point, however, it seemed quintessential to remember that Paul's adjustment of the metaphor implied that both groups are actually integrated in Christ and that the entire parade consists "in Christ". In the light of the sacred writer's teaching about the Church as Christ's Body (Col 1,18) this reality acquires a profound significance. Thus, the ministers and angels triumph with God in Christ. They are sharers in His victory.

In conclusion, and in polarity to the vast majority of commentators, we thought it thoroughly illogical to parallel the apostles and angels with the paraded captives, with the white bull destined for sacrifice, or even with the general himself. Christ is the general who, after defeating the reign of darkness, allows His apostles and angels to partake of His glorious victory.

Saint John Vianney Theological Seminary  
1300 South Steele Street  
Denver, CO 80210

Andreas HOCK

#### SUMMARY

In discussing the meaning of the verb *θριαμβεύειν* in 2 Cor 2,14 and Col 2,15 commentators have failed to compare the two occurrences. This comparison is the purpose of the present study. After scrutinizing the respective expressions *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* (2 Cor 2,14), and *ἐν αὐτῷ* (Col 2,15), after analyzing the dynamics of the participles, and by seeking to identify the persons behind the personal pronouns *ἡμῶς* in 2 Cor, and *αὐτούς* in Col, we arrive at the conclusion that the objects of the parade are not captives, but are incorporated into the triumphant Christ, who, therefore, is the parade.

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Christoph DOHMEN, *Exodus 19–40* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament). Herder–Freiburg–Basel–Wein, Verlag Herder, 2004. p. 415.

C. Dohmen has written an excellent contribution to the interpretation of the book of Exodus. He provides a brief introduction to his work by defining the scope and the aim of the commentary, building on the theoretical work of U. Eco (*I limiti dell'interpretazione* [SB il campo semiotico; Milano 1990]). He distinguishes the genre of commentary writing from the more historical-critical research of monographs. Monographs are aimed at professional readers; and they explore the problems surrounding the history of composition and the identification of multiple authors. The commentary, by contrast, must focus on the present and fixed form of the text and be a guidebook for the “normal reader” (32), a person unfamiliar with the language of the ancient text, who seeks to understand literature which has religious significance as the “word of God”. Thus the commentary must bridge the gap between an ancient text and the immediacy of the reader’s experience, bringing the reader closer to the text through translation and by opening the multidimensional character of the text. The commentary on Exodus 19–40 does not engage the history of composition, nor will it provide a verse-by-verse analysis. Instead Dohmen’s intent is to focus on larger textual units in order “to set free the meaning of the text” (*Textsinn freisetzen*) so that it is experienced in full and thus continues to be effective as the word of God (33).

Dohmen explores briefly the problems of the structure of the book of Exodus and its relationship to the ancestral history in the book of Genesis. The book of Exodus separates into two parts (1–18 and 19–40), not three (as argued for example by J. I. Durham, *Exodus* [WBC 3; Waco TX 1987]). Both sections presuppose the prehistory of the ancestors: Exodus 1,1–5 and 19,3 refer to the “house of Jacob” (Gen 46,27). The two sections, Exodus (1–18) and Sinai (19–40), are inextricably related by the larger theme of the promise of land, indicating an original unity to the literature, rather than separate complexes of tradition. The encounter of the Israelites at Mount Sinai is not the goal of the Exodus, but the point of crystallization in the story, where the Israelites are constituted as the people of God, allowing them to realize the promise of land. The role of Moses as mediator in facilitating the presence of God with the Israelite people emerges as a central theme in Exodus 19–40. The commentary explores the problems surrounding the beginning of Exodus 19–40, since the setting of the divine mountain occurs already in Exodus 17



and 18 (17,5-6; 18,5). In spite of the related motifs, Dohmen concludes that Exodus 17 and 18 provide transition to the revelation at Mount Sinai, rather than indicating the beginning of the larger literary unit as argued, for example, by E. Zenger (*Israel am Sinai. Analysen und Interpretationen zu Exodus 17–34* [Altenberge 1982]).

The revelation and the construction of the sanctuary provide the central clue to the four-part structure of the commentary: (1) the revelation of God and the establishment of covenant (Exodus 19–24); (2) the instructions for the sanctuary (Exodus 25–31); (3) the incident of the golden calf and the renewing of covenant (Exodus 32–34); and (4) the construction of the sanctuary (Exodus 35–40). The end of each section is punctuated by an episode that anticipates the following, thus providing a bridge between the four parts. Exodus 24,12-18 underscores the meeting of God and Moses, preparing for the instruction of the sanctuary. Exodus 31,12-18 returns to the theme of Sabbath as a sign of the covenant, providing transition to the breaking and renewing of the covenant. Exodus 34,29-35 describes the implications of the meeting between God and Moses through the motif of Moses' shining face, anticipating the construction of the sanctuary. And Exodus 40,34-38 indicates the completion of the sanctuary (vv. 34-35), while also pointing the reader ahead to the further establishment of the cult in the book of Leviticus. Exodus 19,4 and 40,34-38 frame the literature, underscoring the role of Yahweh in the Exodus and the continuing presence of Yahweh with the Israelites when they leave Sinai.

The interpretation of the literary units includes: (1) bibliography; (2) a translation with notes; (3) an analysis of the literary unit; (4) an extended interpretation with excurses on important themes and topics; and (5) the "reception and meaning". The methodology is applied to Exodus 25–31, 35–40, as well as smaller literary units in Exodus 19–24 and 32–34: Theophany (19,1-25); Decalogue (20,1-21); Instruction for Covenant (20,22–23,33); Covenant Closing (24,1-18); Turning Away of God (32,1-29); Intercession of Moses and God's Forgiveness (32,30–34,9); and Covenant Renewal (34,10-35).

The strengths of the commentary are far too many to list in a review. The bibliography for each section provides a helpful overview of past research, pointing the reader to additional secondary resources for interpretation. The commentary itself provides little help for the reader in evaluating the secondary research on the book of Exodus. The translation and notes include clarifications on the etymology and meaning of difficult words. The notes on the translation provide only minimal comparison between the *MT* and the *LXX*, *Sam*, or other textual witnesses. For a thorough text-critical examination of the book of Exodus, the reader will be better served by W. H. C. Propp's recent commentary (*Exodus 1-18. A New Translation with Notes and Comments* [AB 2A; New York 1999]). The analysis section of the commentary provides a quick overview of the points of tension and the divergent genres of literature in the different sections of the book of Exodus. The limitation of the section on analysis is the near absence of secondary literature or a review of past solutions to the literary problems that are briefly catalogued.

The heart of the commentary is the section on the interpretation with its

many excurses. The commentary is well informed by Dohmen's extensive research in pentateuchal law and in the literary organization of Exodus 19–40 with its parallels in Deuteronomy. The commentary remains, for the most part, limited to the final form of the text. The focus is on the syntax, the textual organization, and the significant phrases within the smaller literary units of the *MT* version of the Exodus. In the interpretation of the Instruction of the Covenant (Exod 20,22–23,33), for example, Dohmen provides an overall outline of the section, before interpreting the smaller literary units, such as the opening law against images and the law of the altar in Exod 20,22–26. The commentary on Exod 20,22–26 clarifies aspects of the text that would escape the notice or be unknown to the general reader, such as important repetitions in the composition of the text (i.e., 20,22 and 19,4.9.19), the meaning of technical language (i.e., the verb עָשָׂה in 20,23 and its implications for interpreting a monotheistic perspective in the law), or the religious and theological significance of more obscure prohibitions such as an altar of earth without steps. More problematic or complex topics are addressed in the excurses, which are woven throughout the commentary (e.g., The Mountain of God).

The commentary also follows in the tradition of B. S. Childs' volume (*The Book of Exodus. A Critical Theological Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia 1974]) by placing a strong emphasis on the reception and use of the text in Jewish and Christian interpretation. Dohmen regularly guides the reader through the post-biblical interpretation of a passage. The overview often begins with an inner-biblical survey of the text under study. Dohmen regularly includes the history of classical Jewish interpretation, introducing Christian readers to the rich Rabbinic corpus of interpretation on the book of Exodus, before turning to a summary of the complex ways in which traditions of the book of Exodus appear in the New Testament and in the exegetical tradition of the church. One goal of Dohmen in writing the commentary is to introduce the reader to the multidimensional character of the book of Exodus. The reception history of the book of Exodus that is catalogued throughout the commentary aids in achieving this goal.

I have two reservations with the commentary. The first is the writing of Exodus 19–40 before Exodus 1–18. Dohmen notes in the Forward the unusual practice of beginning what will be a two-volume work with the second half of the book of Exodus. He is certainly correct that Exodus 19–40 is important literature in its own right and even more so in view of its many parallels with the book of Deuteronomy. Yet the result of writing the commentary backwards is that the context of Exodus 19–40 is not fully explored throughout the interpretation. Dohmen makes passing reference to the relationship of the Exodus and Sinai and explores briefly the problems of the beginning of Exodus 19–40. But the role of the Exodus from Egypt and the Wilderness Journey are not adequately interpreted in relation to the revelation at Mount Sinai. The role of the Song of the Sea (Exodus 15) as a point of transition in the organization of the book of Exodus is not even mentioned.

My second reservation stems from Dohmen's definition of the genre of a commentary and his accompanying restriction of methodology to reading the present form of a fixed text, which excludes a description of the multiple authors within the literature. The exclusion of multiple authors in the

interpretation of the book of Exodus undercuts the central goal of the commentary to open the multidimensional character of the text for the “normal reader”. And as a consequence there is a tendency to harmonize the present form of the text throughout the commentary, which limits the meaning of the book of Exodus, rather than “setting the text free” and expanding its interpretative possibilities for the reader.

Dohmen’s interpretation of Exod 19,20-25 provides illustration. This is a notoriously difficult text in its present narrative context. It disrupts the flow of the narrative, stopping the conversation between Moses and Yahweh (Exod 19,19) and halting the entire experience of theophany (Exod 19,16-18). The dislocation in narrative logic has prompted interpreters to identify a distinct author (M. Noth), a redactional insertion (C. Houtman), or a later midrash on the role of the high priest (E. Blum). The point of continuity throughout these interpretations is the recognition of distinct voices in the account of the theophany of God on the mountain in Exodus 19. Dohmen harmonizes Exod 19,20-25 within the larger narrative context of Exodus 19 and the Pentateuch as a whole. The descent of God on Mount Sinai in 19,18 is not in tension with 19,20-24, because each text has a distinct focus. The responses of Moses in 19,21.23 are not reminders to the Deity of past instructions, but indirect questions about the sacred and the profane and the need for boundaries. The description of Moses’ descent from the mountain and address to the people in 19,25 is interpreted as his recounting of the instruction from 19,20-24 and not as a new introduction to the Decalogue in Exod 20,1-17. The introduction to the Decalogue in Exod 20,1: “And God spoke all these words saying”, is meant to function on a meta-literary level as information for the reader of the Pentateuch and thus it is not intended to function in the narrative world of the characters. As a consequence the Israelites first hear the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5 as recounted speech by Moses (Deut 5,5).

Dohmen’s interpretation of Exod 19,20-25 eliminates multiple voices in Exodus 19–20, with divergent interpretations on the meaning of theophany and the revelation of the Decalogue. It even harmonizes the two accounts of the Decalogue in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5. Yet Exodus 19–20 could also be read as an instance where Moses recounts the revelation of the Decalogue to the Israelite people, thus creating tension with Exod 19,19 and 20,18-19 and with Deuteronomy 5, where the people hear directly the revelation of law as divine speech. This interpretation would require the identification of multiple authors, who advocate distinct interpretations on a range of themes including the revelation of law, the nature of the cult, and the role of Moses as mediator.

My point in reviewing Exod 19,20-25 is not to pick one interpretation over the other. It is rather to raise the question of how a commentary provides the multidimensional meaning of the text for the “normal reader”. I would argue that it is crucial for all readers, not just professional readers, to be aware of the multiple voices in the canonical text. Identifying multiple authors underscores that the reader cannot embrace with equal commitment all of the voices in the Canon. Such insight provides the basis for self-criticism and religious tolerance in the Canon itself, a quality that is decreasing daily in our neo-orthodox and neo-fundamentalist world. The very structure of the canonical text demands that the reader negotiate divergent interpretations

with a hermeneutic that fashions potentially contradictory voices into a complimentary relationship, thus providing the framework for social tolerance. When the commentary presents only a harmonized reading of the present form of the text, the ability of hermeneutical and social compromise is lessened, since the responsibility for embracing the full multidimensional meaning of the text is taken away from the “normal reader”. In this case the religious experience of the “normal reader” may well be authentic, but it runs the risk of also becoming absolute and thus intolerant.

Dohmen has written an insightful commentary on the present form of Exodus 19–40, paying particular attention to its relationship with the book of Deuteronomy. His reading of the text is always helpful and often original. The commentary is supplemented with an index of all Scriptural citations. The review would not be complete without mentioning the quality of the book. Herder Verlag has produced a beautiful volume with a clear layout, flawless printing, and sturdy binding. I look forward to Dohmen’s second volume on Exodus 1–18.

United Theological Seminary  
Dayton, OH; USA

Thomas B. DOZEMAN

Timo VEIJOLA, *Das 5. Buch Mose. Deuteronomium. Kapitel 1,1–16,17* (ATD 8,1). Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 2004. x-366 p. 16,5 × 24.

This, the latest volume in the esteemed ATD series, was written by the now tragically deceased Finnish scholar who was one of the leading proponents, indeed one of the founders, of the so-called “Göttingen” school or approach to the Deuteronomistic History. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that its focus is literary (source) critical, specifically the uncovering of the redactional layers that the author perceives as lying behind the composition of the present book of Deuteronomy.

Veijola lays out his approach quite nicely in the brief (five page) introduction to the commentary. After a single-page discussion of the book’s name, content, and text, Veijola turns to its origin and intent. Ironically, he begins by stating that Deuteronomy in its final form reads as a perfect unity. He then outlines the layers that he perceives in the book’s production. Veijola finds five principal layers in Deuteronomy. The first is the original form of the book (Ur-Dtn), long identified by scholars as its foundation. Stemming from Josiah’s reform at the end of the seventh century, this work sought to promote the centralization of the cult exclusively in Jerusalem and to update the older Covenant Code (Exod 20,24–23,19) in light of the principle of centralization. Within Deut 1,1–16,17, the heading of 4,45\* and the introduction of 6,4–9\*, including the *Shema*, originate with Ur-Dtn. Thereafter, Ur-Dtn is discernible behind specific laws regarding centralization (Deut 12), tithing (14,22–29), remission of debts (15,1–11), freeing of Hebrew slaves (15,12–18), the firstborn (15,19–23), and pil-

grimage festivals (16,1-17).

The next layer is the *Grundschrift* of the Deuteronomistic History identified by Noth (DtrG). The Deuteronomistic Historian (DtrH), writing shortly after Jehoiachin's release from prison (ca. 560 BCE), the last event recorded in DtrG, presented his revised version of the Ur-Dtn law code at the beginning of his work as the standard against which Israel's history is evaluated. Thus, the fundamental layer of Deuteronomy 1-3 is the work of DtrH. His hand is to be distinguished in this material, among other criteria, by Moses' use of the first person plural.

Following the "Göttingen" approach, the original DtrG was redacted in three successive layers, the first two during the exile and the third in the early post-exilic period. None of the three is to be considered an individual; they were rather small groups of redactors with similar perspectives and, apparently, vocabulary and style. The first of these is a prophetically oriented Deuteronomist, DtrP, whose most significant contribution to Deuteronomy was the incorporation of the Decalogue (Deut 5,1-6,1\*). DtrP borrowed the Decalogue from Exodus 20 and supplied it with a framework that presents Moses as the mediator between Yahweh and the people. The Decalogue thus serves as the foundation for the laws and paranesis subsequently presented in Deuteronomy.

DtrP's basic viewpoint was further developed by the next layer, DtrN (for "nomistic"), which evinces a special interest in law and accents Moses' role as interpreter and teacher of the law.

More important than both DtrP and DtrN in Deuteronomy is the early post-exilic layer, DtrB (*bundestheologisch*), isolated by Christoph Levin, which is basically responsible for the present form of the book. DtrB begins in Deuteronomy 4 and is distinguished by its undifferentiated use of singular and plural forms in addressing Israel and by its similarities to ancient Near Eastern treaties and loyalty oaths. DtrB stresses the first commandment ("You shall have no other gods beside me") as the key to Israel's future.

In addition to these three major redactional layers, Veijola finds evidence of numerous late- and post-Dtr expansions reaching all the way to ca. 300 BCE. Some of these are isolated insertions, while handfuls of others have enough in common to be assigned to the same editor or circle. Among the latter Veijola highlights the work of an editor who added the demand for carrying out *herem* (Deut 7,25-26; 13,16b.17a?<sup>\*</sup>βb. 18a), another who diluted DtrB's stress on the importance of obedience to the law by emphasizing God's love for unrighteous Israel (4,36-40\*; 7,7-11; 9,1.3-6), and yet another, post-P reviser who placed the Sabbath commandment at the center of the Decalogue and added a social-ethical dimension to other laws (5,12-15; 15,11[?].15; 16,3aβ<sup>\*</sup>bβγ.12; 24,18.22). Among the latest redactional phases Veijola identifies a handful of additions that claim priestly status and functions for the Levites (10,8-9; 12,12bβ.19; 14,27.29aα<sup>\*</sup>), indicating the existence of controversy in the postexilic community over the identity of the priesthood, and a couple of successive expansions reflecting an anti-Samaritan polemic (11,29-30).

This volume is a *tour de force* for Veijola and a model of the scholarship emanating from Göttingen. As a result, it will be quite useful for

introducing students and other readers to this approach. Veijola is an extremely careful and judicious literary critic, who pays close attention to the minutiae of the text. The commentary is well-organized, readable, and very "user friendly". Each pericope is rendered in translation, the layers perceived in the text are represented by different levels of indentation. A synthesis of the literary analysis comes next, followed by a detailed exposition of each successive layer. The expositions often conclude with brief remarks about a given layer's theological or social-historical content.

The major problem with the commentary is that its value stands or falls on the validity of the *Schichtenmodell* that it represents—a model against which serious criticisms have been leveled. It seems unlikely, first of all, that a work of literature could have been composed in such a complicated fashion and still retain the unity and coherence that Veijola admits for Deuteronomy. It is not unusual for Veijola's analysis to yield half a dozen or more layers in a given pericope. He finds four, for instance, in Deuteronomy 8. Yet this chapter is taken by many scholars as a compositional unit because of its sophisticated chiasmic structure, which Veijola recognizes. If the compositional history of Deuteronomy was this complicated and yet its redactors this skilled at retaining its overall structure and coherence, it would seem virtually impossible for any modern critic to be able to separate the layers as neatly as Veijola claims to do. Veijola hints at an analogy for this complicated picture by identifying Deuteronomy's redactors as early pioneers of the interpretive techniques employed by later rabbinic scholars. But the analogy is inappropriate; Deuteronomy is not the Talmud. It does not present itself overtly as a compilation of the opinions of different teachers. Nor does the Talmud evince the kind of redactional strata sought by Veijola in Deuteronomy. There is no good analogue for the *Schichtenmodell* assumed in this approach.

Other facets of this compositional model seem unrealistic. The criteria used to isolate different layers afford little allowance for authorial creativity. Veijola treats techniques such as ring composition and literary resumption (*Wiederaufnahme*) purely as signs of redaction without permitting them for authors (e.g., 218, 255, 296). Repetition is precluded as part of an author's style. Even more problematic is the notion of "redaction by committee" behind the conception of DtrP, DtrN, and DtrB. We actually discover half way through the commentary that the DtrB group were adherents of the DtrN circle (190). How can the analysis be so sophisticated as to identify individual redactors elsewhere—sometimes those responsible for only a couple of widely separated sentences—and yet fail to be able to separate individual hands within this school? Indeed, what kind of redactor adds only a handful or fewer widely separated remarks to a book the size of Deuteronomy (e.g., 292, 326)? This separation of redactions on the basis of theme or topic is methodologically risky, as it assumes that an author cannot display interests in several such topics.

The search for layers sometimes yields curious results, not the least of which concerns the Decalogue. In Veijola's analysis, the original version of the Decalogue lacked both the prohibition against images (Deut 5,8) and the Sabbath commandment (5,12-15). But in order to preserve the number ten, Veijola is forced to reckon the prohibitions against worship of other



gods (5,9) and coveting the neighbor's house or field as originally distinct commandments rather than as extensions of the commandments against making images and coveting in general. This very different delineation presumes that Deuteronomy's version of the Decalogue as it now stands is dependent on Exodus 20 with its Sabbath commandment and thus ignores evidence for the primacy and origin of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy (see S.L. McKenzie, *Covenant* [Understanding Biblical Themes; St. Louis, MO 2000] 136-139).

In short, this commentary is one of the very best examples of a particular approach to biblical scholarship and particularly the Deuteronomistic History. It is, in my view, an approach that is fatally flawed. However, I would like to separate the method from the man. Whatever the weaknesses of the *Schichtenmodell*, Timo Veijola himself was a model of scholarship and gentility. This commentary, one of, if not the last, of his publications, will endure as a tribute to the meticulous work of a colleague, whose career ended much too soon and who will be sorely missed.

2000 N. Parkway  
Memphis, TN 38117

Steven L. MCKENZIE

Paul NISKANEN, *The Human and the Divine in History*. Herodotus and the Book of Daniel (JSOTSS 396). London – New York, T & T Clark International, 2004. vii-143 p. 16 × 24. £55.00.

Niskanen begins his study by complaining that in the study of Daniel there have been two types of oversight: (1) Some scholars have largely ignored the historical elements in Daniel in favor of the eschatological component, denying that the historiographical material in Daniel has any value. (2) Other scholars have minimized the influence of Greek sources in Daniel in favor of Mesopotamian or Iranian sources despite the fact that Daniel “was certainly written in the middle of the second century BCE” (2), when Greek culture made a definite impact on Palestinian Jews. That dating is imprecise; the book was written before the death of Antiochus IV in 164 BC, as Niskanen later admits (8; see also his comments, 118 and 120, on Dan 11,45). A. Momigliano has pointed out that the succession of world empires found in Greek and Roman historians appears first in the *Histories* of Herodotus, and outside Greek historiography this succession shows up first in Daniel. Niskanen goes on to argue that “reading the texts of Herodotus and Daniel together can prove illuminating for the historical material in Daniel by providing a context for its origin and a key for its interpretation” (4).

Herodotus (484-425 BC) not only described what happened but also why it happened. Niskanen makes a good case that the author of Daniel knew the Greek language and either directly or indirectly was influenced by Herodotus's *Histories*. He rightly emphasizes that Judaism and Hellenism “were neither competing systems nor incompatible concepts”, as should be



obvious from the fact that the Hellenized Eupolemus was one of the envoys Judas Maccabeus had sent to Rome (1 Macc 8,17; 2 Macc 4,11) (8-9). E. Bickerman and M. Hengel have made scholars more aware of Hellenization in Palestine. After surveying the study of S. Mandell and D.N. Freedman who showed the influence of Herodotus on the Primary History, and the work of F. Nielsen that compares Herodotus and the Deuteronomistic History, Niskanen describes the research of other scholars who have examined how the authors of Esther and Judith were also familiar with Herodotus.

Niskanen then demonstrates how the author of Daniel knew and used Herodotus. He begins by discounting the influence of the Iranian texts *Bhaman Yasht* and *Denkard* on the composition of Daniel 2 where the four metals symbolize the four kingdoms: Babylonian-Median-Persian-Greek. He notes that Daniel's schema of the four kingdoms does not appear at all in these Iranian texts; rather, the schema derives from the Greek historiographical tradition. He also dismisses as a possibility for the schema the Babylonian Dynastic Prophecy, a very fragmentary text in Akkadian. He then writes: "The series of kingdoms found in Greek historians beginning with Herodotus corresponds more exactly to the kingdoms in Daniel than do those found in the eastern texts" (36). In Daniel the substitution of Babylonia for Assyria makes sense, as commentators have remarked, in the context of Israelite history. The inclusion of Media in the schema, since Media never conquered or ruled over Judea, makes sense only if we consider foreign sources for Daniel's four kingdoms. Herodotus apparently derived the Assyria-Media-Persia sequence, well known among later Greek historians, from the Persian sources on which he based his account (1.95). Niskanen shows how Daniel 11, which describes by way of *prophetia ex eventu* a series of interrelated political and military events, "is comparable to the Greek historiographical tradition beginning with Herodotus" (47).

Niskanen next considers the roles of the king and the sage, the two main forces in history, as these are portrayed in Daniel and Herodotus. He observes that the author of Daniel begins his story where the Deuteronomistic History had left off. He starts with Nebuchadnezzar, following the conventional pattern of depicting foreign kings as God's agents to punish unfaithful Israel (Dan 1,1-2). What Daniel writes of the kings in the court tales from the well-intentioned Darius (chapter 6) to the scoundrel Belshazzar (chapter 5) and the enigmatic Nebuchadnezzar (chapters 1-4) is that the God of Israel is in control of history, and not these kings. In somewhat the same way, Herodotus affirms that the great kings in his histories also become subject to fate and the envy of the gods.

The dream visions, introducing a new genre, contain the same views of God's involvement in human history. The four beasts in Daniel 7 symbolize the four kingdoms mentioned in chapter 2, the fourth beast being the worst, culminating in Antiochus IV. The two beasts in chapter 8 represent Medo-Persia and Greece and their kings. Chapters 9 and 10 say little about kings. But with chapter 11 Daniel begins a new historical survey, beginning with the four Persian kings that correspond to the four Persian kings in Herodotus, and again culminating in the infamous Antiochus IV. Niskanen remarks that the dream visions mirror the historical evidence concerning the rise and fall of the kingdoms of Xerxes, Alexander, the Ptolemies and Seleucids, and

especially Antiochus IV. Herodotus contains a vast number of kings and tyrants. But it is the great kings of Persia that provide an analogy with the kings in Daniel, for these kings are the primary concern of both Daniel and Herodotus. The story of Cambyses in Herodotus has striking similarities to the story of Antiochus in Daniel; both tyrants were vicious and committed sins against their own gods. Even the death scenes of both are comparable: "Both kings hear rumors from the east that greatly trouble them and cause them to hurry back. Both kings die in the province of Syria before they reach their destination. Both die with no one to help them" (71). Herodotus and Daniel alike make the connection between the sacrilegious behavior of these villains and their deaths. In the account of Antiochus's death the author invented elements that depart from the usual historical account in chapter 11; these elements match Herodotus's story of Cambyses's death.

In the court tales Daniel and his three companions, because of their God-given wisdom, enter into the court of a foreign king. Daniel, preeminent among his fellow Jews, displays his knowledge and skills in chapters 2, 4, and 5 where even the pagan monarchs acknowledge that God alone is the source of Daniel's wisdom. In the second half of the book, Daniel receives visions that require an angelic interpreter, who in turn adds a degree of separation between the divine and human spheres, thus emphasizing the judgment of the court tales that wisdom and power belong to God alone. In Herodotus the role of the sage is also highlighted at the expense of the king. In Daniel and Herodotus the wise alone can interpret dreams and oracles regarding future events.

While human beings are involved in historical events there is a parallel divine causality that also makes things happen. The kings in Daniel are of course free agents, but the author makes the point that they are not in control of history. The various intrigues of Antiochus IV, for example, will not prevent his disgraceful downfall that God revealed in visions to Daniel. Although in Herodotus there is an implicit or explicit acknowledgement of a multiplicity of gods, they act as if they were one god. "Heaven no longer wars with itself as it did in the great Homeric epics" (93). In Herodotus, as in Daniel, future events are foretold in dreams and oracles, which in turn require interpretation. Lesser gods come closer to humans through dreams and visions, somewhat like the angels in Daniel. The dreams in Herodotus, like those in Daniel, deal mostly with dynastic succession. Both Daniel and Herodotus underscore the mysterious hand of God in history. It is up to each individual with divine help to see God's will in nature, dreams, oracles, and portents. By interpreting the divine message correctly, one can then live in harmony with God's activity in history and help to bring about the divine plan.

In sum, there are indeed many parallels between Herodotus and Daniel: the schema of the four kingdoms; the comparable stories of the deaths of the wicked kings Cambyses and Antiochus IV; the dreams and visions that foretell the rise and demise of kings and kingdoms; the interaction of divine and human causation in historical events. Niskanen anticipates a possible objection to his thesis, namely, that Jewish tradition can explain the historical vision of Daniel. His response is that, although the author is in continuity with that tradition, Daniel does offer a distinctive development that cannot be

accounted for by the earlier tradition alone. Nebuchadnezzar and Antiochus IV represent the limits of the history that is of interest to Daniel.

Niskanen summarizes his thesis in the last paragraph of the book: "Daniel, like Herodotus, is concerned with his nation's history and its place among the kingdoms of the world. Like Herodotus, he is able to see the finger of God in human affairs, guiding history forward to bring about what must be, without taking away from human freedom and responsibility" (125). In general, Niskanen has argued his thesis well although he often repeats himself needlessly. Perhaps inevitably, he tends to exaggerate some connections between Herodotus and Daniel.

I raise one objection: throughout the book, Niskanen refers to the *author* of Daniel, as if a single individual composed the book's different chapters; he does, however, refer to "the final author/editor of the book of Daniel" (8) and later admits that there are clear indications of several authors and stages of composition though he favors a continuity between the court tales and the visions (52-53). Nonetheless, in the final chapter he writes: "It is reasonable to suggest that a cultured Jew such as the author of Daniel, who was versant in both Hebrew and Aramaic, would also have studied the Greek language through its major literary works" (106). Indeed, if, as is quite probable, more than one author composed the court tales as well as the four apocalypses, would they all have had the degree of familiarity with Herodotus that Niskanen argues for a presumed single author? The complex questions about the authorship of the various chapters of Daniel deserve much more comment than Niskanen provides.

An appendix examines the difficult text of Dan 11,2b. Then follow an ample bibliography, an index of references, and an index of authors.

The Catholic University of America      Alexander A. DI LELLA, O.F.M.  
Washington, DC 20064 USA

## Novum Testamentum

James G. CROSSLEY, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*. Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity (JSNTSS 266). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2004. xv-245 p. 16 × 24. £65.00.

Since J.A.T. Robinson's provocative but unsuccessful attempt in the nineteen seventies to get scholars to rethink their views on the standard dating of the New Testament (*Redating the New Testament* [London 1976]), and his own radical hypothesis that they were all to be dated before the fall of Jerusalem, relatively few scholars have tended to tackle this complicated subject afresh. Where the date of the Gospel of Mark is concerned, two recent sorties into this field have yielded completely different results. In B.J. Incigneri's *The Gospel to the Romans. The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel* (Biblical Interpretation 65; Leiden – Boston 2003), a date late in 71 CE after Titus' defeat of the Jews, and a setting in Rome among Christians traumatized by the Neronian persecution is proposed. At the other end of the spectrum, P.M. Casey, in *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (SNTSMS 102; Cambridge, UK 1998) advances the view that a date c. 40 CE is highly probable for the Gospel in light of its alleged use of Aramaic sources.

J.G. Crossley was a doctoral student of Casey, and it is not surprising, therefore, that his doctoral dissertation, submitted to the University of Nottingham in 2002, slightly revised and now recently published, should build on the work of his supervisor. Arguing on the basis of Synoptic treatment of legal controversies, and with W.C. Allen's older work also as an influence (*The Gospel according to Saint Mark* [Oxford Church Biblical Commentary; London 1915]), Crossley goes even further than Casey, however, in positing a date for Mark sometime between the mid to late thirties and the mid forties. Historical-critical in its approach (though unimpressed by the results of modern Gospel criticism), this is a competent and professional treatment of its subject, as befits a published dissertation, and it will find a worthy audience among biblical scholars, postgraduates and interested laypersons. The inevitable misprints, notwithstanding ('Josephus', for example, appears as 'Josphehus' on at least five occasions), the style and content are accessible, although some of the discussion is extremely involved (especially in the later chapters), and at times opaque, and in some cases might tax some readers' powers of comprehension (his response to critics, given in the introduction, for example, might have been reserved for later, when the reader might be expected to be more *au fait* with the arguments).

After a somewhat idiosyncratic expression of acknowledgments, the author takes up his subject in more serious vein, reviewing and evaluating in the first chapter the external evidence in favour of both the standard date (65-75 CE) for the Gospel and earlier dates (i.e. dates within the lifetime of the apostle Peter). The second chapter examines the major piece of internal evidence for dating, namely, chapter 13, and discusses in particular those views that favour potential settings in the Romano-Jewish War (the second

half of the sixties and early seventies) or the earlier Caligula crisis (c. 40 CE). Other arguments based on modern methods of biblical interpretation (source, form, redaction and literary criticism) are treated in the third chapter. The remaining chapters (4-7) claim to develop a new approach to the question by relating the date of the Gospel to the apparent assumptions made by its author regarding the observance of biblical laws, and to the ways in which Matthew and Luke in turn redact the Markan text with regard to issues of Torah-observance. It is these discussions, both general and with respect to test cases, that lead to his overall, surprising and highly controversial conclusion of a very early date for the Gospel.

Crossley's major thesis is supported in a series of steps. The conclusion of his first chapter is hardly controversial, since he claims that the external evidence, such as that of Irenaeus and the 'Anti-Marcionite Prologue' is 'of uncertain historical worth' (9), and that 'the early church traditions cannot be used with any confidence to date Mark' (18). Dismissing N.T. Wright's arguments for the historicity of Mark 13, and arguing for the passage's secondary origin, Crossley maintains in chapter 2 that the plausibility of the various theories for its setting (including the Jewish War and Caligula crisis) leads to the conclusion that the Gospel might have been composed anywhere between the mid to late thirties and c. 70 CE. Other possible alternative determinants for the date of composition (the results of source, form and redaction criticism, the Gospel's relation to Paul), taken up in chapter 3, including the discussion of passages other than Mark 13 (e.g. Mark 11,15-17, the cleansing of the Temple) and the presence of motifs in Mark (such as persecution), which may point to its setting, are found to be just as vague, unhelpful or speculative as those based on the apocalyptic discourse.

In chapter 4, Crossley presents his new(-ish) approach, namely, the use of what he claims is the more precisely datable evidence of legal controversy in early Christianity to provide the answer. Rejecting the common view that Mark's Jesus is portrayed as in radical tension with his Jewish heritage, and particularly its legal tradition, Crossley claims, to the contrary, that the Markan Jesus is presented as a Torah-observant Jew, albeit involved in intra-Jewish disputes with his opponents, the Pharisees, over their expansions of the biblical law. Matthew's Jesus preserves this Markan portrait but makes it more explicit. The Lukan Jesus, likewise, 'disputed Sabbath halakah with his opponents but without breaking any biblical regulations' (113). 'It can be argued with some justification', he concludes, 'that in all three synoptic gospels Jesus is portrayed as a Torah observant Jew in conflict with Jews dedicated to expanding and developing the biblical laws' (123).

With its assumption of a Torah-observant Jesus (and, by implication, of a Markan community of similar allegiance), Mark's Gospel must have been composed before early Christians began to question certain aspects of the biblical Torah, such as Sabbath observance and the food laws. Hence the thrust of Crossley's fifth chapter, which attempts to trace the development of such non-observance as indicated in sources such as the Pauline letters and Acts, in episodes or events such as the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15/Gal 2,1-10) or the Antioch incident (Gal 2,11-14) and in traditions such as that of Stephen and the Hellenists (Acts 6-7) or Peter's Vision (Acts 10,1-11,18). Analysis of this evidence suggests that the mid-forties was the turning-point,

Christianity, he claims, being 'largely law observant for at least the first 10 to 15 years after the death of Jesus' (157).

The last two chapters test the hypothesis by examining in detail certain key Markan passages and their Matthean and Lukan parallels: Mark 2,23-28 (Sabbath observance); 10,2-12 (divorce and remarriage) and Mark 7,1-23 (the food laws and issues of purity and impurity). In each case Mark appears to assume what the later writers could not (the Torah-observant nature of not only Jesus but the Markan community), and so 'the Markan passage must have been composed before such disputes arose in early Christianity' (183).

Apart from its central case for an unusually early date for Mark (and its corollary, therefore, that Mark may have influenced Paul, and not vice versa), there are a number of other contentions here that make this book distinctive: the doubt cast on the value of Mark 13 (in light of more than one plausible setting) and other normally debated passages and themes for ascertaining the date of the Gospel; its emphasis *per contrarium* on the importance of the Synoptic portrayal of Jesus and the Torah as a key factor in the determination of the date of Mark; its assertion that the Synoptic Jesus never violates biblical law, only the biblical laws as expanded by the Pharisees; its downplaying, in consequence, of such Markan motifs as the 'anti-familial' or 'anti-Temple' theme; its declaration that the beginnings of early Christian non-observance of the Torah can be accurately determined; its attribution to Mark of an intimate knowledge of Jewish legal thought; its call for the rabbinical purity system (whose dating is problematical) not to be ignored in any discussion of legal issues such as hand washing, and its claim that passages like Mark 7,1-23 should be read wholly in the context of intra-Jewish dispute.

This, then, is a thesis with some very radical elements. This reviewer could agree with Crossley on a number of the general points made, especially in the preliminary chapters; for example, his claim that the external evidence for the dating of Mark's Gospel is historically unreliable, and it is the internal evidence which counts. I would concur, too, with his view that Mark 13 is secondary, and support the arguments he marshals against N.T. Wright's claim that it goes back to the historical Jesus (although its general picture of Jesus as an apocalyptic prophet has, in my view, a basis in history). Crossley is also right in asserting that the historical Jesus is unlikely to have envisaged a full-blown mission to the Gentiles, and that belief in the second coming was a product of the early church, and not a tenet of the historical Jesus.

But these points of agreement are peripheral to the book's main assertions, which no few New Testament scholars (and not least this reviewer) would find very difficult to accept. *Pace* N.H. Taylor ("Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis. Part II. The Markan Eschatological Discourse", *JSNT* 62 [1996] 13-41), the Caligula crisis (c. 40 CE) as a potential setting for Mark 13 has far less to commend it than the events surrounding the Romano-Jewish War (66-70 CE). Crossley's even-handedness and lack of discrimination in face of the relative strengths and weaknesses adhering to potential *Sitze im Leben* for the Gospel is one of the weaknesses of his presentation, and he downplays the force of the arguments that support the standard view (65-75 CE) and that link its main themes to specific events immediately prior to the fall of Jerusalem (the Gentile

mission, especially following Paul's missionary endeavours, the Neronian persecution, the Jewish War, etc.). A sounder way to proceed would be to look at the range and weight of evidence provided by the application of a number of criteria (and not the sole 'legal' determinant for which he opts), and to test any potential setting against its ability to make sense of the whole text—as Incigneri (who, incidentally, is not cited) does, for example.

Crossley's third chapter presents the reader, in my opinion, with too ready a dismissal of form-critical insights into the nature, and development of oral tradition, and the putative timescale (some forty years) involved in the process that led to Gospel composition. His suggestion that Paul may have known the Gospel of Mark, and not *vice versa*, is a view that clearly flies in the face of the long acknowledged, puzzling, and hence much debated, paucity of reference by the apostle to the Jesus tradition. Where insufficient weight is given in chapter 2 to Mark 13,1-2 as a probable *vaticinium ex eventu*, his dismissal in chapter 3 of the 'anti-Temple' theme in Mark also effectively removes an important piece of evidence for a post-70 CE date. Despite admitting that the literary context of Mark 11,15-17 has the destruction of the Temple as its *leitmotif*, he claims that Jesus' action in the Temple is related to its abuse (economic exploitation of the poor, with Simon ben Gamaliel's criticism of the expensive price of doves being cited as a parallel, m. *Ker.* 1.7) and not to its demise, and (notwithstanding 11,16) is not intended to imply the end of the sacrificial system. The rending of the veil, too, is symbolic of 'mourning' on God's part, and not 'judgment', and the cursed fig-tree representative of the Jewish leaders rather than, as its literary context suggests (and as I have argued fully in *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree. A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition* [JSNTSS 1; Sheffield 1980]), the Temple.

But it is what Crossley has to say in chapter 4 about Jesus and the law that is most likely to provoke disagreement. If the Jesus of the Gospels (and especially the Markan Jesus) is a Torah-observant Jew who opposed expansions to the biblical law, this makes him closer historically to the Sadducees than the Pharisees, a finding that is, to say the least, idiosyncratic! While the Matthean Jesus can be considered much more of a Torah-observant Jew than the Markan Jesus, key passages like the 'antitheses' (Matt 5,21-22. 27-28. 31-32. 33-37. 38-39. 43-44), the eating of grain on the Sabbath (Matt 12,1-8), the discussion on the food laws (Matt 15,1-20), the 'let the dead bury their dead' saying (Matt 8,22), the ruling on divorce (Matt 19,3-9), or the Temple tax (Matt 17,24-27) — all passages discussed by Crossley — indicate that the matter is not clearcut.

Other aspects of the argument are weak. With the mid-forties taken as the turning-point in Christian adherence to Torah-observance, Crossley's attempts in chapter 5 to downplay the very early evidence (prior to a putative composition of Mark's Gospel by the early forties) of anti-Torah and anti-Temple attitudes and rhetoric in the primitive Christian movement seem rather forced; as, for example, his treatment of Stephen and his interpretation of Stephen's speech (esp. Acts 7,48) as not being an attack on the Temple as such but (like the cleansing of the Temple) an attack on Temple abuses, or his claim that Paul, before his conversion, was attacking Christians, not for



abandoning their allegiance to the (biblical) law, but for opposing (in the same fashion as the Synoptic Jesus) Pharisaic expansions of it.

Interpretation of his chosen test-case passages in chapters 6 and 7 is also at times flawed. Crossley's suggestion that the 'absolute' nature of the Markan divorce and remarriage pericope (Mark 10,2-12) indicates that it comes from the earliest Jewish stratum of the tradition — Crossley accepts Casey's Aramaic source theory, a hypothesis that has not, however, commanded widespread support — is contradicted by its assumption (relevant only to the Roman world) that a woman could divorce her husband, and the few cited exceptions, as in the case of Salome, hardly nullify this point. 'Mk 7.1-23 is dealing with tradition,' it is alleged, 'and further contrasting this polemically with biblical law' (191), and hence no abandonment of the biblical food laws is being advocated, but there is surely some strained (and somewhat tautologous) exegesis involved in the claim that in declaring 'all foods clean' (Mark 7,19), the Markan Jesus was actually 'declaring all foods *that are permitted to eat in the Torah* to be clean thereby denying the role of *handwashing*' (192). The weight of this argument is weakened, however, in his admission that Mark 7,1-23 could be read as an attack on the biblical food laws, and that this 'is most probably the reason it is omitted in Luke' (114).

In short, while Crossley offers interesting and potentially valuable discussion on the interpretation of the legal passages in the Synoptic Gospels, the degree of interpretative difficulty involved in these passages, as his own discussion indicates, makes his 'legal controversy' criterion just as precarious a determinant of date as the other criteria he so roundly dismisses. Dating New Testament documents, like the Gospel of Mark, is a difficult enterprise but it cannot be resolved by appeal to one sole determinant.

Dept of Theology and Religion  
University of Durham, England

William R. TELFORD

Annette MERZ, *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 52), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht – Fribourg (CH), Academic Press, 2004. xii-465 p. 16 × 24. €69

La question se pose à toute nouvelle approche appliquée à l'exégèse biblique de savoir si elle ouvre des voies nouvelles dans la manière d'aborder les questions d'interprétation et de les résoudre? La réponse est certainement positive pour l'approche intertextuelle qu'A. Merz met en œuvre de manière convaincante pour l'interprétation des épîtres pastorales (1 et 2 Tm; Tt), dans cet ouvrage qui reprend sa thèse de doctorat, présentée à la faculté de théologie de l'Université de Heidelberg en 2000-2001.

Après une brève présentation des buts et des enjeux de la recherche (1-4), A.M. consacre une ample introduction à l'exposition et à la discussion du

phénomène de l'intertextualité et de son étude dans les sciences littéraires, afin de dégager un certain nombre d'instruments appropriés à analyser les diverses formes et fonctions de l'intertextualité des textes du premier christianisme (5-71). Cette discussion théorique sera d'ailleurs illustrée par des analyses appliquées à des textes des épîtres pastorales (1 Tm 2,15; 4,3-5; 2 Tm 2,19; 4,17).

Si l'intertextualité comprend toutes les relations possibles entre textes, son analyse se concentre plus particulièrement sur les relations entre des "pré-textes", ou "textes de référence", et le texte étudié qui s'y réfère par citations certes, mais aussi à travers toute autre forme de rappel et d'écho, imitation, allusion, reprise de structure ou de genre littéraire. Pour l'analyse intertextuelle, qu'il ne faut pas confondre avec une critique des sources et des influences, l'accent n'est justement plus sur le repérage de la source pour comprendre le texte, mais bien sur le texte qui sélectionne, articule et transforme ses sources. A travers l'identification et la description des relations intertextuelles spécifiques, il s'agit de dégager le rôle des "pré-textes" dans la constitution du sens du texte sous examen. Si généralement l'exégèse a concentré son attention sur ce que le texte qui en cite d'autres, où y fait allusion, gagne en potentialité d'interprétation, A.M. insistera sur la réorientation qu'un texte fait subir aux "pré-textes" qu'il utilise, par des modifications, des commentaires, des critiques ou une reprise actualisante (*referenztextorientierte Funktion der Intertextualität*). Ainsi, par exemple, en 1 Tm 5,18, pour motiver la juste rétribution de l'ancien qui exerce une charge, l'auteur peut tenir pour acquise l'interprétation métaphorique de Dt 25,4 ("tu ne muselleras pas le bœuf") déjà fixée par 1 Co 9,9 pour légitimer le droit de l'apôtre à être entretenu par la communauté. C'est sur cette fonction interprétative d'énoncés protopauliniens, exercée par la pseudépigraphie des pastorales, qu'A.M. concentrera particulièrement son attention.

La deuxième partie de l'étude traite la question de la première réception des pastorales et de leur fonctionnement comme "pré-textes", ou textes de référence, au même titre que d'autres lettres de Paul, dans les épîtres d'Ignace d'Antioche et de Polycarpe (72-194). C'est l'occasion pour A.M. de reprendre les débats sur la datation des pastorales, qu'elle situe peu avant le tournant du premier siècle. L'approche intertextuelle repense également la question de la dépendance littéraire. Il ne s'agit plus d'isoler des citations, des allusions, des échos ou d'autres traces de références, mais de s'interroger d'abord sur la conception d'ensemble de l'écrit ou du groupe d'écrits en examen. Quel est le projet littéraire qui régit l'intégration des "pré-textes" (87-113)? On vérifiera dans le détail du texte, à l'aide de critères d'évaluation précis, le degré d'intensité et d'intentionnalité des relations intertextuelles.

La proximité de l'épître de Polycarpe aux Philippiens avec les pastorales a été reconnue depuis longtemps. Polycarpe s'inscrit dans la tradition chrétienne qui le précède où, entre autres, les lettres de Paul tiennent une place de choix. Par des références nombreuses, des allusions et divers points de contact, Polycarpe crée un climat "d'intertextualité permanente" que A.M. passe au crible des critères d'intensité et d'intentionnalité intertextuelle. S'inscrire dans la ligne de Paul et se l'approprier, telle est la perspective. Non seulement les pastorales interviennent comme écrits dont l'authenticité paulinienne ne fait aucun doute (117-133), mais elles se révèlent

déterminantes dans la réception de Paul, notamment, par exemple, pour la compréhension de la justice qui se concrétise par la condamnation de l'amour de l'argent telle qu'elle est exprimée en 1 Tm 6,10.7 (cf. 117-122: PolPhil 3,1-4,1).

La réception opérée par Ignace est également envisagée à partir de son projet de se présenter comme disciple et successeur de Paul. La représentation de l'apôtre honoré dans son dernier voyage guide son imitation. Comme lui, il s'abaisse tout en revendiquant une autorité pour son enseignement, "à la manière des apôtres", son ethos se renforce du martyre vers lequel il se dirige (Selbststilisierung des Ignatius als Paulusnachfolger 147-155). Cette perspective d'ensemble oriente les reprises de formes et d'éléments aux lettres de Paul que les destinataires d'Ignace sont supposés bien connaître. Ici encore, les pastorales, considérées comme les autres épîtres de Paul, jouent un rôle important, en offrant à Ignace leur modèle du combat contre l'hérésie, de l'institution des ministres, de l'approche au martyre.

Cette *Imitatio Pauli* est également la clé d'explication de l'existence de la lettre d'Ignace à Polycarpe de Smyrne que la lettre qu'il destine déjà à la communauté de Smyrne semble rendre superflue. En outre, la lettre à Polycarpe met en œuvre une parénèse indirecte analogue à celle de 1 Tm et Tt, alors qu'un tel modèle de communication ne correspond pas à ce que nous savons de la relation entre Ignace et Polycarpe. Selon A.M., Ignace ne se contente pas d'emprunter à Paul des énoncés, ou même la lettre comme modèle, c'est la forme même d'un *corpus paulinum* constitué aussi bien de lettres à des communautés qu'à des individus qu'il imite et qui fonctionne comme système de référence.

La troisième partie, le cœur de la recherche, est consacrée aux épîtres pastorales elles-mêmes et à leur travail de réélaboration de "pré-textes", ou textes de référence, notamment des épîtres protopauliniennes (195-375). Une telle analyse a pour but de déterminer le "lieu intertextuel" et historique du texte. D'un côté il s'agit d'identifier les liens, repérables par des indices, qui inscrivent tel texte dans l'univers des textes comme à un carrefour où certains d'entre eux se rencontrent selon des densités ou des intensités plus ou moins grandes. D'autre part on prendra en compte la succession des textes dans leur enchaînement historique. Spécifiquement il s'agit de situer les pastorales en tant qu'écrits pseudépigraphes dans le cadre des traditions pauliniennes contemporaines et dans leur relation aux lettres protopauliniennes. A la suite des travaux de P. Trummer, A.M. considère que les pastorales sont nées comme collection de lettres de Paul avec la prétention de donner l'interprétation définitive de l'ensemble du corpus paulinien. C'est dans cette perspective que leurs énoncés se réfèrent aux traditions et au corpus paulinien.

Consciemment l'auteur des Pastorales met en place sa prétention à être Paul, sachant qu'il ne l'est pas. Parmi les diverses relations intertextuelles entre les pastorales et le "pré-texte" des lettres de Paul, — comme la double pseudonymie, de l'auteur et des destinataires, ou certaines autres références nominales, ou encore la reprise de certaines formes littéraires, ou d'autres formes d'intertextualité allusive, etc. —, la plus significative est l' "autointerprétation fictive de Paul" (qui donne son titre à l'ouvrage de A.M. *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus*). Selon la fiction littéraire de la

pseudépigraphie, par l'“auto-référence”, Paul se présente comme son propre interprète, et à travers cet artifice, l'auteur de la pseudépigraphie peut, face à des interprétations concurrentes, fixer, orienter, actualiser, corriger les significations des textes pauliniens de référence. La motivation de la pseudépigraphie ne s'explique donc pas uniquement par la transformation de la situation historique des communautés qui requiert de nouvelles réponses. La pseudépigraphie s'inscrit dans une lutte pour l'héritage de Paul, dans un conflit d'interprétation. L'auto-référence fictive est une arme littéraire, un mode intertextuel de construire le sens qui vise à priver les interprétations concurrentes de leur prétention à se présenter comme héritage de Paul.

Deux motifs sont retenus pour démontrer cette thèse. D'une part la discussion sur la relation maître – esclave (Tt 2,9s et surtout 1 Tm 6,1-5, 244-267), où il s'agit, entre autres, de neutraliser l'effet d'un texte comme Phlm 16, en rappelant (1 Tm 6,2) que la relation de fraternité entre un esclave chrétien et un maître chrétien ne doit pas devenir l'occasion de mettre en cause les hiérarchies sociales.

D'autre part, la dispute sur le rôle de la femme, à qui il n'est pas permis d'enseigner (1 Tm 2,12), fait l'objet de l'enquête la plus ample et la plus approfondie (1 Tm 2,9-3,1, 268-375). Dans les pastorales, création et rédemption sont mobilisées pour justifier les distinctions et la spécificité de la femme. La sotériologie égalitaire de Ga 3,28 cède le pas à des itinéraires particuliers et différenciés. Si pour Timothée, figure du ministre, l'enseignement est déterminant pour son salut (1 Tm 4,16), pour la femme c'est par la maternité qu'elle se sauvera (1 Tm 2,15), elle qui n'a qu'un second rang dans l'ordre de la création (2,13) mais le premier dans celui de la transgression (2,14). Encore une fois, de par le jeu intertextuel, qui n'est pas généalogique mais aussi rétroactif, c'est à la lumière de cette dernière interprétation que seront compris les textes pauliniens antérieurs (1 Co 11,8-9; 14,34s; 2 Co 11,3).

Une dernière partie synthétise brièvement les résultats de la recherche et les perspectives qu'elle ouvre (376-387). La prétention à être la dernière interprétation de l'héritage paulinien est considérée par A.M. comme sincère, l'auteur se perçoit en continuité avec Paul. Plus discutable l'utilisation de la fiction pseudépigraphique pour modifier le sens des énoncés du corpus paulinien “pré-texte” pour se prémunir contre ce que l'auteur perçoit comme des falsifications de Paul. Pour A.M. il est important de reconnaître la prétention des pastorales à être cette dernière interprétation de Paul, non pas en épousant la perspective d'un Paul “canonique”, ce qui représenterait un retour à une lecture précritique, mais en l'interprétant comme le témoignage de la conflictualité qui a accompagné la réception de Paul. La contribution à une telle approche critique qu'A.M. attribue à son étude est d'avoir montré comment s'est constitué littérairement le filtre à travers lequel Paul a été présenté.

Une bibliographie de plus de 50 pages et trois indexes complètent le volume (la littérature antique non seulement biblique, un index analytique par sujet, les auteurs modernes).

Au terme de cette étude magistrale, on regrettera peut-être que le caractère pseudépigraphique des pastorales soit présumé comme acquis, sans discussion (72, n. 1 et 2). On le sait, la question de l'authenticité des

pastorales a été reprise récemment, notamment dans l'exégèse anglosaxonne (M. Prior, J. Murphy O'Connor, Ph.H. Towner, L.T. Johnson, etc.), il aurait été intéressant de vérifier si sur cette question précise également l'approche intertextuelle renouvelait le débat ou confirmait des acquis.

L'ouvrage est rigoureux et dense d'une vaste information dont l'accès est rendu sans doute difficile par une certaine technicité de langage, d'autant plus que la terminologie de l'analyse intertextuelle n'est pas unifiée d'une langue à l'autre, ni non plus d'un auteur à l'autre. Mais ce qui fait la grande qualité du travail d'A.M. c'est que l'analyse intertextuelle n'est pas présentée comme une nouveauté substitutive des méthodes plus classiques. Elle est proposée comme une possibilité d'approfondir des acquis obtenus par les recherches antérieures de l'exégèse, qui sont à chaque fois rappelés et évalués avec soin. Cette continuité critique est mise en oeuvre à travers toutes les analyses présentées et donne à l'ensemble de l'étude sa force de conviction. L'analyse intertextuelle telle que la pratique A.M. permet de mettre en ordre les acquis de la recherche précédente, d'en identifier les limites et de proposer des dépassements et de nouvelles solutions. Exemplaire à ce propos la discussion de la grille d'analyse de l'intensité et de l'intentionnalité intertextuelle qui renouvelle, je dirais de l'intérieur de l'histoire de la recherche récente, la problématique de la dépendance littéraire (87-113). Pour mener à bien un tel travail il est nécessaire de maîtriser tout le champ des débats affrontés, et A.M. ne donne jamais l'impression de faillir à cette exigence.

Facoltà Valdese di Teologia  
Via Pietro Cossa 42  
00193 Rome

Yann REDALIÉ

## Varia

Ingrid HJELM, *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty. Zion and Gerizim in Competition* (JSOTSS 404; Copenhagen International Seminar 14). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2004 xii-372 p. 16 × 24. £85.00

This monograph is a revised English translation of a doctoral thesis submitted to the Theological Faculty at the University of Copenhagen and builds on Hjelm's previously published work, *The Samaritans and Early Judaism. A Literary Analysis* (JSOTS 303; Sheffield 2000). It is divided into seven chapters and includes a table of contents, preface, and list of abbreviations as front matter and a bibliography and indices of references and authors as back matter. It addresses several issues but chiefly it is concerned, as its title suggests, with the religious or theological rivalry between Gerizim and Jerusalem as centers of worship in historical Judaism. On the whole, Hjelm's

study reflects diligent scholarship, attention to detail, and a challenge to conventional orthodoxies.

In the opening chapter, Hjelm critiques previous research on the origins of the so-called Deuteronomistic literature, Zion ideology, and the historical reconstructions of scholars who have tackled these subjects. She argues that the redaction-critical reconstructions are dependent on the pre-formulated hypotheses of the scholars who excise the various strands of the biblical texts, as suggested by their lack of agreement on the number and perspective of the redactors. She also notes that the chronologies associated with these strands rely on the biblical traditions themselves and their internal chronology, presupposing some degree of historicity. Unsatisfied by that scholarship, Hjelm ultimately situates her own work in relation to the studies of John Van Seters, Thomas Thompson, and Niels Peter Lemche.

Hjelm, while sympathetic to the methodological approaches and conclusions of this scholarly triumvirate, is not uncritical of their work. Van Seters and Thompson, in particular, are foils at the outer edges of an argument Hjelm tries to split. On the one hand, she tacitly agrees with Van Seters' goal to situate the biblical traditions in an historical context, though she is highly critical of Van Seters' proposed reconstructions. On the other hand, Hjelm tacitly accepts Thompson's arguments for a theological interpretation of the biblical traditions that illumines the intellectual world in which the traditions were written but avers that the theology is itself "an expression of realities that begs for attention" (20). Her *via media* is a theological, historically anchored interpretation and dating of the biblical traditions.

Having identified her problem and situated her own critical methodology, Hjelm lays out her goals: (1) to "examine the composition of the Deuteronomistic History (the book of Kings), using the Hezekiah narrative in 2 Kings 18–20 as a focus", (2) to establish the "provenance and compositional relevance of the Hezekiah narrative for the book of Isaiah" and particularly as a foundation myth of a "Davidic Yahweh Zebaoth cult", (3) to explore "Jewish-Samaritan discussions about text traditions" in light of Van Seters' portraits of the Deuteronomist and the Yahwist, (4) to analyze "the function of the Law *and* the prophets" within the Jewish tradition, (5) "to examine extra-biblical sources in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in order to follow datable traces of [Zion] ideology", and (6) to synthesize the results of these investigations "in light of [her own] previous work on Samaritans and Early Judaism" (28–29).

In the second chapter, Hjelm examines the composition of the book of Kings with particular reference to the story of Hezekiah in 2 Kings 18–20. Hjelm divides this chapter into ten sections of varying breadth and detail, which explore five major issues: (1) the problem of the historicity of the Hezekiah narrative, (2) the structure and themes of the Hezekiah narrative, (3) the judgment formulae in the book of Kings as well as the nature of the sins enumerated in them, (4) the function of the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah, and (5) the juxtaposition of exile and the Davidic covenant and how this defines the 'way of David'.

Hjelm's analysis of historicity is somewhat perfunctory and fluctuates from an argument about historical issues, relying heavily on I. Finkelstein – N.A. Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed*. Archeology's New Vision of Ancient

Israel and the Origin of its Sacred Texts (New York 2001) and her own interpretation of the contrasts between Assyrian primary sources and the biblical narrative, to an argument implicitly dependent on the dichotomy that literature and ideology are not history. Curiously, although Hjelm spends considerable time on the historical issues, she subsequently denies any interest in the historical issues, writing at one point, "As we are not dealing mainly with a historical-critical but a literary analysis in this chapter, it suffices to say this story-writing has not much to do with Judah and Israel of the Iron Age" (82). Most will not find Hjelm's analysis of the historical issues persuasive; they will either agree or disagree dependent on their own pre-formulated views of the issues. Nevertheless, Hjelm's rejection of any substantial historical resonance in the narratives and a relatively dramatic claim, which she revisits later, that the composition of Kings dates to the second century BCE are essential to the thesis of the book. Any person who does not accept these propositions will have a difficult time with Hjelm's analysis.

Hjelm's challenges to some traditional approaches bear fruit, however, particularly in the literary analysis to which she is clearly more intellectually committed. She quite adeptly exposes the weakness of historical and redactional reconstructions that depend on a grandiose interpretation of the political claims in the Hezekiah and Josiah narratives. Her analysis of the structure and themes of the Hezekiah narrative, the judgment formulae as a unifying device in Kings, the function of Hezekiah's and Josiah's reforms, and the concept of the 'way of David' places stress upon the religious claims and makes a strong argument for the coherence and interdependence of the narrative.

In the third chapter, Hjelm explores the "provenance of the Hezekiah narrative" and its function within the book of Isaiah (93). The chapter contains eleven sections, which begins with a discussion of the composition of Isaiah. Hjelm, while not denying a certain diachronic complexity to Isaiah, denies the facility and utility of redaction-critical theories concerning the book and gives little credence to internal narrative chronology of an historical Isaiah. Instead, she argues that "Isaiah could have 'prophesied' at any time between the first return from exile until the book's physical appearance among the Dead Sea Scrolls" (100).

After this discussion of the composition of Isaiah, Hjelm investigates the origin of the Hezekiah narrative; specifically, is it original to Isaiah or Kings? Notably, Hjelm takes the position that the Hezekiah narrative belongs originally to Isaiah and "intrudes on, and even distorts, the narrative discourse in Kings" (104). She also argues for the unity of the narrative and so against the theories of two complete and intertwined narratives, as initially suggested by Stade.

One of the most engaging sections of the entire book is Hjelm's analysis of the Isaianic material in light of Assyrian royal ideology. In this section, Hjelm's skills in literary analysis really emerge as she traces mythological themes and motifs (e.g. dragon and sea motifs), cosmological concepts of center over periphery and order over chaos, and ancient Near Eastern heroic typologies. She adeptly reveals the ways in which the author of Isaiah appropriates the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Ugaritic themes, motifs, concepts, and typologies and merges them with biblical mythology. She does not,



however, consider the implications that this intertextuality may have on the origin and date of the material.

In the fourth chapter, Hjelm examines “agreement and conflict in Jewish and Samaritan text traditions”. The chapter is divided into four major sections, including a review of tradition history problems related to the composition of the Hebrew Bible, especially the theories of Van Seters, an examination of the Samaritan traditions concerning the pre-exilic period, a review of the competition and relationship among the cult places of Shiloh, Shechem, and Jerusalem, and a look at the Samaritan-Jewish debates over these issues in the post-exilic period.

In her review of tradition history, Hjelm identifies a central problem that she feels theories to date have not sufficiently addressed, namely “the lack of interest in the patriarchs in the Deuteronomistic History and the so-called pre-exilic Prophets” (170). For Hjelm, this lack of interest implies that “the differences between the so-called Deuteronomistic History (with or without Deuteronomy) and the Pentateuch (with or without an additional book of Joshua) might be a difference between Jerusalem and Samaria” (173). Consequently, she suggests, as she did in *Samaritans and Early Judaism*, that the Jews may have adopted the Pentateuch from the Samaritans and not the other way around.

In the rest of the chapter, Hjelm is concerned with the competition between cult places in Jewish and Samaritan tradition. After a review of the “Masoretic” and Samaritan traditions on this point, she concludes that the supersessionism of both traditions implies an historical setting in which a policy of cult centralization was being effected. It is Hjelm’s (largely unsupported) contention that the only period such cult centralization occurred in first millennium BCE Palestine was the Hasmonean period; otherwise, Hjelm argues that “synchrony and co-existence were the norm for Palestine’s regional cult centres” (209). While it is generally accepted that Yahwism had many different centers throughout the first millennium, Hjelm fails to substantiate her claim that a policy of cult centralization only occurs in the Hasmonean period and, in any case, there is little reason to believe such a political policy is a precondition for supersessionist literature. Rather, such a policy would only explain why a certain supersessionist tradition achieved pre-eminence over another. Her failure to address such points undermines her thesis.

In the fifth chapter, Hjelm investigates the ‘reinvention’ of the Mosaic covenant in the “Masoretic” tradition. Hjelm notes that in both the “Masoretic” and Samaritan traditions the Elide priesthood in Shiloh serves as a crux. In the Samaritan tradition, the Elide priesthood represents an apostazing challenge to the authority of Gerizim and so the root cause of the “split among the tribes of Israel” (223). In the “Masoretic” tradition, Yahweh’s rejection of the Elide priesthood precipitates the prophetic office and the prophetic office in turn inaugurates kingship and testifies to divine legitimation of the Davidic line and Jerusalem as the chosen place of Deut 12,8-14. In this way, Hjelm argues the “Masoretic” tradition “favours those who adhere to the Davidic and Mosaic covenant against those who only submit to the Mosaic covenant” (253).

In the sixth chapter, Hjelm looks at the nature and development of Zion

ideology, starting with a brief recapitulation of the Davidic-Jerusalem-Zion ideological matrix in the Hebrew Bible. Hjelm observes that Ezra-Nehemiah and other literature of the 'restoration' does not invoke this ideological matrix. Indeed, "no biblical book narrates a fulfillment of these expectations" (258). Consequently, Hjelm looks outside the Hebrew Bible to intertestamental literature and especially 1 and 2 Maccabees.

In an extensive summary of 1 Maccabees that occupies the bulk of her chapter, Hjelm traces the realization of Zion ideology in that book. In doing so, she seems to give some credence to the program of cult centralization presented in the book and seems to accept that the ideological claims of the book reflect the ethos of the period it describes — two things she explicitly denies for the Hebrew Bible in her final chapter.

In the seventh and final chapter, Hjelm draws her conclusions. Chiefly, she argues biblical literature reflects the divisiveness created by the Hasmonean policy of cult centralization:

"The viability of such discussions about traditions and cult place in extra-biblical literature of the third century BCE to the second century CE, suggests that our biblical texts and Samaritan traditions also reflect these post-exilic discussions rather than any pre-exilic establishment of a Davidic kingdom. The image of such a unified kingdom, to whose authority everyone shall be subjected, is held up as a negating reflex of the divisiveness that characterizes the world in which our authors live. The biblical canon's implied problem of establishing Abraham's heir is not an easy problem to solve, when several candidates appear on the scene. The divisiveness related to tribal relations presented already in the Abraham narrative, continued in Jacob and Esau's fights over blessing and inheritance and reiterated in the sons of Jacob's anticipation of Joseph's and Judah's struggle for sovereignty reflects the tribal and geographical divisions, which are our authors' problem. The implicit reality of our texts reflects the biblical books of Joshua-Judges rather than 2 Samuel" (297).

For Hjelm, the apparent diachrony of the biblical texts, especially the Deuteronomistic History, is an illusion designed to explain and ultimately justify the ideological agenda of the Hasmoneans. In the final analysis, Hjelm rejects the conclusions of tradition-historical, form-critical, and redaction-critical research as founded on the mistaken assumption of a diachronic textual development, loosely based on a naïve reading of the texts and its internal chronology. For her, the Deuteronomistic History is primarily a retrojection of the author's present and constitutes a warning not to oppose the Hasmonean agenda of cult centralization.

For my part, I doubt that Hjelm's challenge to traditional orthodoxies will find much support. Significantly, her intextual reading of the Deuteronomistic History and Maccabees leaves uninvestigated the reasons why the former places significant emphasis on the legitimation of the Davidic line while the latter, even though it claims a fulfillment of Zion ideology, de-emphasizes Davidic expectations. Perhaps even more problematic, Hjelm's proposed provenance for the biblical traditions largely ignores the problems posed to it by datings of the Old Greek and early Qumran manuscripts, especially 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, generally held to be one of the earliest of the Qumran biblical texts; the assumed knowledge of biblical literature in texts such as Sirach, Jubilees,

the Cairo Genizah Damascus Document, and the works of Artaphanus, Pseudo-Hecataeus, and Demetrius the Chronographer; the significant diachrony implied, if not proven, by the intertextuality in the biblical corpus, the linguistic and formal variation of biblical Hebrew, and the quality and level of knowledge of geography, history, ideology, and literature from the pre-exilic period reflected in many biblical passages.

Despite this, Hjelm's study is a well-documented and highly sophisticated work. Scholars and students, even those who disagree with Hjelm, will find a lot of useful analysis and will have to take into consideration her arguments for the unity of Kings and the priority of Isaiah's Hezekiah narrative over its parallel in Kings as well as some of her ideological readings. Hjelm has also, as she did in her earlier work, shown the important role that the later Samaritan traditions might have on readings of the Hebrew Bible and our understanding of the post-exilic period and Jewish-Samaritan traditions. The book is, therefore, recommended.

The Pennsylvania State University  
Weaver Building, University Park, PA, 16802

Kenneth A. RISTAU

James C. VANDERKAM, *From Joshua to Caiaphas. High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press – Assen, Van Gorcum, 2004. xix-548 p. 15,1 × 23,5. € 38

This monumental work, the result of almost two decades of research, traces the history of the Jewish high priesthood from its beginnings in the early post-exilic period to its end in the Herodian period, and is the most exhaustive treatment currently available of the history of high priesthood. Following an initial chapter discussing the first high priest, Joshua ben Jehozadak, VanderKam divides the rest of his study into four major parts: the Persian period, the early Hellenistic period, the Hasmonean high priests, and the Herodian age. Each of these four chapters is basically structured as a chronologically-ordered survey of each of the high priests in turn, although this is not always rigorously maintained because there are sometimes issues to address that resist accommodation to such a structure. Such issues include the chronology and completeness of the high-priestly lists for the Persian period that appear in Nehemiah 12, discussed in chapter 2 (85-99) in an updated version of material first published in 1991; the evidence from Hecataeus of Abdera and the political situation in Judea in the early Hellenistic period, discussed at the beginning of chapter 3 (113-124); and the question of Judas Maccabeus's alleged high priesthood and the so-called *intersacerdotium* between 159 and 152 BCE, examined in chapter 4 (240-250) with reference to material first published in 1990.

In terms of content, these five chapters take the form of an exhaustive examination of the sources for each high-priestly figure rather than a continuous historical account of their lives and functions, no doubt because the evidence for individual high priests is often fragmentary and disputed,

making a continuous history difficult or impossible to achieve. In both its scope and its detail VanderKam's treatment is impressive, covering a wide range of primary sources including rabbinic and Qumran materials, and the discussion often goes into enormous detail concerning the scholarly opinions and questions that have been raised about each source. However, the effect of the approach is sometimes a little disorientating because of the lack of a clear historical framework, and at times, there is something of a tendency to get bogged down in the detailed source analysis, which could be more concise. This sense of disorientation is compounded by a certain amount of repetition between sections where sources have been used to illuminate more than one high priestly figure, which leaves the reader unclear on occasion as to precisely which period is being addressed, especially as no dates are given for some of the earlier high priests. Of course, it is not always easy to date (or to identify!) the high priests with certainty, and to that extent the lack of specificity in the course of the text is understandable; however, VanderKam clearly does have ideas about where each individual fits chronologically speaking, as is indicated by the list of high priests plus dates at Appendix 1, and in the later chapters the high priests are introduced with their dates at the beginning of the sections where they are discussed. It might have been helpful to do this with the earlier figures too, even if only to give an approximate date or to specify roughly when the high priest in question is thought to have served, so as to give a chronological anchor for the discussion.

VanderKam's approach to the sources is in general marked by a high estimate of the amount of reliable historical information that can be elicited from them, a principle that he sets out in his preface with particular reference to nonhistorical texts: 'I have ... tried not to dismiss too quickly the claims made about high priests in texts that appear to be nonhistorical in genre. Historical facts can turn up in strange places' (ix). Whilst there is no denying the truth of this statement, it can be difficult to tell what is an historical fact and what is not, and on occasion it seems that too little account has been taken of the text's particular ideological concerns. An example of this is the protracted discussion in chapter 3 (124-137) about the letter from the Spartan king Areus to Onias the high priest which is cited in 1 Maccabees 12. VanderKam argues for the letter as authentic, and regards it as evidence for the politically elevated status of the high priest at the turn of the fourth and third centuries BCE. His discussion is extensive, covering a range of scholarly questions that have been raised about the letter, and dealing one by one with the objections to its authenticity that have been raised. However, the one question which he fails to address convincingly is the question of motivation: why would a powerful Spartan king want to link himself with the Jews at this period? VanderKam cites other instances of such links claimed by Greeks that took place either with respect to other nations (134) or with respect to the Jews at a later date (135); but for Greeks to claim common past with the imperial powers of Egypt or Persia, or indeed for a Greek city in Asia Minor in the time of the wealthy and powerful John Hyrcanus I to claim friendship between their ancestors and the Jews' ancestors, is a different matter from a powerful Spartan ruler claiming association with an obscure and at this stage politically impotent subject nation. Certainly, VanderKam cites Hecateus' *On the Egyptians* as the source for the ostensible Spartan belief that the two

peoples were related (135-136), but even granted this potential source for the supposed link it is difficult to see why Areus would bother pursuing it and how it might enhance the Spartans' political status or further their political ambitions. VanderKam also cites the links between Sparta and Egypt in the early third century that some scholars of ancient history invoke as a possible explanation for a link with the Jews, given that the Jews were part of the Ptolemaic empire (132, 133); but again, it seems unlikely that Sparta would want to form attachments with the Ptolemaic empire's subject peoples if the intention was to pursue a political alliance with Egypt. Had the Jews been independent allies of Egypt at this time, one could perhaps understand such an approach to them from Sparta, but this was not the case. Accordingly, I find it difficult to believe that the letter could in fact be authentic, and would disagree with VanderKam's conclusion (137) that it should be taken as evidence that the high priest had significant political status at the beginning of the third century BCE.

Chapters 4 and 5, on the Hasmonean and Herodian high-priests, chart what might be deemed the zenith and nadir of high priestly power, demonstrating that although the Hasmonians held the power of civil governance as well as the supreme priestly office, the Herodian high priests did not, but were (admittedly influential) cultic officials subject to constant dismissal and replacement at the hands of the Roman officials responsible for Judea. Like the foregoing chapters, these are characterized by rigorous examination of the sources and an assessment of the various scholarly opinions on contested issues, such as whether John Hyrcanus or Alexander Jannaeus was the original subject of Josephus's story about the Hasmonean who broke with the Pharisees over an insult. The arguments on such issues are comprehensively — indeed, exhaustively — presented, although there is still room for disagreement on occasion. One such occasion is the question of who appointed Simon Maccabee as high priest, given that Simon is never explicitly shown being appointed as high priest, but is simply addressed as such by Demetrius II (1 Macc 13,36), and is later said to have been appointed by 'the people' (ὁ λαός, 1 Macc 14,35). On the basis of the use of the term *λαός* elsewhere in military contexts to refer to soldiers, and of similarities between the account of Simon's appointment by 'the people' in 1 Macc 13,8b-9a and Jonathan's appointment by the remnant of Judas's army in 1 Macc 9,28-30, VanderKam argues that the 'people' who appointed Simon high priest were the Hasmonean army (279, 280). VanderKam observes that Jonathan's army is referred to as *λαός* by Trypho in 1 Macc 12,44, and suggests that these troops, whom Trypho tricks Jonathan into dismissing and who are then pursued by Trypho's own soldiers, are the same ones who arrive safely in Judah (1 Macc 12,52) and are the *λαός* who are then rallied by Simon so that they appoint him their new leader (1 Macc 13,1-9) (278-279). It is certainly true that in places, including some in 1 Maccabees, the term *λαός* has the more restricted sense of 'army', but it seems unlikely in this instance. Surely the point of Trypho calling Jonathan's army 'people' is to emphasize his insistence that he and Jonathan are not at war, by referring to Jonathan's soldiers as civilians; it is a deliberate demilitarizing strategy rather than a technical term for a military force. Also, it is true that these same people reach Judah in great fear and mourning for Jonathan (1 Macc 12,52),

and a couple of verses later a similarly fearful people is assembled by Simon in order to encourage them (1 Macc 13,2-3); but between the statement that the soldiers return in great fear and mourning and the description of Simon summoning an assembly, there is the comment that ‘all Israel’ mourned deeply and that all the surrounding nations tried to destroy them (1 Macc 12,52-53). This broadens the focus from the remnant of Jonathan’s army to the whole nation, so that the natural referent of the term ‘people’ in 1 Macc 13,2 is not just the army but all Israel. Additionally, in 1 Macc 13,10, after the ‘people’ (1 Macc 13,7) have accepted Simon as their leader, Simon is said to assemble all the warriors (πάντας τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς πολεμιστάς) in order to fortify Jerusalem. This implies a distinction between the people in general who have made the appointment and those who would actually be fighting in battle. The reason for VanderKam’s interpretation of λαός as ‘army’ rather than ‘populace’ is to explain the lack of a clear statement about when Simon was appointed high priest. Somewhat surprisingly, Simon is not said to have been appointed high priest at the gathering described in 1 Macc 13,2, the most likely occasion for this appointment to have taken place; but if the ‘people’ at that gathering were the army, who unilaterally appointed him as high priest, it might be seen by some as an improper usurpation of the king’s powers, and so would not be mentioned at this juncture (281). Indeed, the subsequent decree confirming Simon as leader and high priest (1 Macc 14,27-45) implies that not everyone supported Simon’s appointment as high priest (1 Macc 14,43-45) (282). However, it would presumably be equally improper for an *ad hoc* civilian constituency to usurp the king’s right to appoint a high priest; and even appointments by popular acclaim do not necessarily win universal support. Hence, it is not necessary on this account for the constituency who appointed Simon to be limited to the army.

When all is said and done, though, it would be surprising if all VanderKam’s conclusions on individual issues found favour with every reader, and the strength of his treatment is as much in the issues that are raised as in the conclusions reached. In its comprehensive approach to both the succession of high priests and the ancient sources in which they appear, his encyclopaedic treatment of the Second-Temple high priests is an invaluable resource. Its strength is its wide-ranging examination of sources and scholarship; its weaknesses are a tendency on occasion to over-estimate the historical value of the ancient sources and to get bogged down in detailed discussion of scholarly *cruces interpretum* so that the thread of the wider presentation is obscured. However, it is sure to find its place as a benchmark, of which any future work on the history of the high priesthood will need to take account.

King’s College London  
Strand  
London WC2R 2LS

Deborah ROOKE

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 2006-2007. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 284, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	24	227	16	267
Fac. Orientalistica	2	3	20	25
Universi	26	230	36	292
Nationes	63	Alumni	292	
Dioeceses	155	Alumni	167	
Inst. Religiosorum	42	Alumni	79	
Inst. Religiosarum	14	Alumnae	14	
Ex statu laicali	32	Alumnae	22	
		Alumni	10	

### Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

GRANADOS ROJAS Juan Manuel, *La reconciliación en las cartas a los Efesios y a los Colosenses* (magna cum laude). Moderatore: Prof. ALETTI Jean-Noël, S.J.

DA SILVA Luís Henrique, «Io e il Padre siamo una cosa sola». *Studio esegetico di Gv 10,22-39* (magna cum laude). Moderatore: Prof. BEUTLER Johannes, S.J.

SETTEMBRINI Marco, *Sapienza e storia in Dn 7-12* (summa cum laude). Moderatore: Prof. GIANTO Agustinus, S.J.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

PALMISANO Maria Carmela, «Salvaci, Dio dell'universo!». *Studio dell'eucologia di Sir 36H,1-17* (Analecta Biblica 163; Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Roma 2006, pp. 468).

BIANCHINI Francesco, *L'elogio di sé in Cristo. L'utilizzo della «peritologia» nel contesto di Filippesi 3.1-4,1* (Analecta Biblica 164; Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Roma 2006, pp. X+322).

PORTALATIN Antonio, *Temporal Oppositions as Hermeneutical Categories in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (European University Studies, Series XXIII: Theology, 833; Peter Lang, Frankfurt 2006, pp. XVIII+296).



FISTILL Ulrich, *Israel und das Ostjordanland. Untersuchungen zur Komposition von Num 21,21–36,13 im Hinblick auf die Entstehung des Buches Numeri* (Oesterreichische Biblische Studien 30; Peter Lang, Frankfurt [2006], pp. 274).

DA SILVA Luís Henrique, «Io e il Padre siamo una cosa sola». *Studio esegetico di Gv 10,22-39* [estratto] (Roma 2006, pp. 81).

BELLI Filippo, *L'argomentazione di Paolo e l'uso delle Scritture d'Israele in Romani 9-10* [estratto] (Roma 2007, pp. 103)..

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

En este Elenco aparecen todos los libros enviados a *Biblica*, de alguna manera relacionados con los estudios bíblicos. La mención de un título en este Elenco no implica por tanto juicio acerca de la obra. El consejo de dirección determina qué libros serán recensionados en *Biblica*.

Los libros y fascículos que non han sido expresamente pedidos por *Biblica* no serán devueltos al remitente, aún cuando no parezca conveniente publicar una recensión sobre ellos.

Todos los libros y fascículos enviados a *Biblica* se transmiten al Editor del *Elenchus of Biblica*, y aparecen en él a juicio de dicho Editor.

Envíense los libros a: Dirección *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, via della Pilotta, 25 I-00187 Roma, Italia.

**Gamble**, Harry Y., *Libri e lettori nella chiesa antica*. Storia dei primi testi cristiani (Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia: Supplementi 26). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2006. 332 p. 15,5 × 23. €31,40

**Gane**, Roy, *Cult and Character*. Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy. Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2005. xxi-394. 15,5 × 23,5. \$39,50

**Garbini**, Giovanni, *Introduzione all'epigrafia semitica* (Studi sul Vicino Oriente antico 4). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2006. 417 p. 15,5 × 23. €49,70

**Georgi**, Dieter, *The City in the Valley*. Biblical Interpretation and Urban Theology (Studies in Biblical Literature 7). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. xxviii-370 p. 15 × 23. \$34,95

**Gerhards**, Meik, *Die Aussetzungsgeschichte des Mose*. Literar- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem Schlüsseltext des nichtpriesterschriftlichen Tetrateuch (WMANT 109). Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 2006. x-294 p. 15 × 22,5. €44,90

**Gordon**, Robert P., *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions*. Selected Essays of Robert P. Gordon (SOTSMS). Aldershot, Ashgate, 2006. xxxi-375 p. 16 × 24. £75,00

**Gräbe**, Petrus J., *New Covenant, New Community*. The Significance of Biblical and Patristic Covenant Theology for Current Understanding. Bletchley, Paternoster, 2006. xx-254 p. 15 × 23

**Grätz**, Sebastian, *Das Edikt des Artaxerxes*. Eine Untersuchung zum religionspolitischen und historischen Umfeld von Esra 7,12-26 (BZAW 337). Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2004. ix-343 p. 16 × 23,5

**Grelot**, Pierre, *The Language of Symbolism*. Biblical Theology, Semantics, and Exegesis. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2006. x-238 p. 14 × 21,5. £11,99

**Guijarro**, Santiago (coord.), *Los comienzos del cristianismo*. IV Simposio Internacional del Grupo Europeo de Investigación Interdisciplinar sobre los Orígenes del Cristianismo (Bibliotheca Salmanticensis, Estudios

284). Salamanca, Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 2006. 254 p. 17 × 23,5. €16

**Haþþórsson**, Sigurður, *A Passing Power*. An Examination of the Sources for the History of Aram-Damascus in the Second Half of the Ninth Century B.C. (ConB Old Testament Series 54). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2006. viii-304 p. 15,5 × 22. SEK 310,–

**Hahn**, Scott, *Letter and Spirit*. From Written Text to Living Word in the Liturgy. New York – London – Toronto, Doubleday, 2005. xvii-238 p. 14,5 × 21,5. \$21.95

**Heil**, John Paul, *The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians* (Studies in Biblical Literature 15). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. xiii-309 p. 15 × 23. \$35.95

**Helmer**, Christine (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation*. History, Context, and Reality (Symposium Series 26). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. xii-181 p. 15 × 23. \$24.95

**Henderson**, Suzanne Watts, *Christology and Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark* (SNTSMS 135). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006. xvii-287 p. 14 × 22. £48.00 – \$90.00

**Hengel**, Martin, *Der unterschätzte Petrus*. Zwei Studien. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2006. x-261 pp. 11 × 18. €24

**Heraclitus**, *Homeric Problems*. Edited and Translated by Donald A. Russell and David Konstan (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 14). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. xxx-144 p. 15 × 23. \$20.95

**Herrmann**, Wolfram, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Geschichte und Bedeutung des israelitisch-jüdischen Glaubens. Stuttgart, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2004. 384 p. 16 × 24. €29 – SFr 50,70

*4 Baruch (Paraleipomena Jeremiu)*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Jens Herzer (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 22). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. xlii-212 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

**Himbaza**, Innocent, *Le roi Manassé*. Héritage et conflit du pardon (Essais bibliques, 40). Genève, Labor et Fides, 2006. 149 p. 15 × 22,5. CHF 29 – €19

**Horrell**, David G., *Solidarity and Difference*. A Contemporary Reading of Paul's Ethics. London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2005. xvi-339 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £25.00

**Horsley**, Richard A., *Galilea*. Storia, politica, popolazione (Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia: Supplementi 27). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2006. 385 p. 15,5 × 23. €34,90

**Hübner**, Ulrich (Hrsg.), *Palaestina exploranda*. Studien zur Erforschung Palästinas im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert anlässlich des 125jährigen Bestehens des Deutschen Vereins zur Erforschung Palästinas (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 34). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2006. In Kommission. xix-330 pp. 17 × 24,5. €68

**Hugo**, Philippe, *Les deux visages d'Élie*. Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17-18 (OBO 217). Fribourg, Academic Press – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006. xxii-389 p. 16 × 23,5

**Hull**, Michael, *Baptism on Account of the Dead (1 Cor 15:29)*. An Act of Faith in the Resurrection (Academia Biblica 22). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. xv-327 p. 15 × 23. \$42.95

**Hurtado**, Larry W., *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God? Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus*. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005. xii-234 p. 15 × 23. \$20.00 – £11.99

*Invention and Method*. Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus. Translated with Introduction and Notes by George A. **Kennedy** (Writings from The Greco-Roman World 15). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. xix-271 p. 15 × 23. \$32.95

**Iwanski**, Dariusz, *The Dynamics of Job's Intercession* (AnBib 161). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006. xviii-391 p. 16,5 × 24. €25

**Jackson**, Bernard S., *Wisdom-Laws. A Study of the Mishpatim of Exodus 21:1–22:16*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006. xv-552 p. 16 × 24

**Jaroš**, Karl, (Hrsg.) *Das Neue Testament nach den ältesten griechischen Handschriften*. Ruppolding, Verlag Philipp Rutzen – Würzburg, 2006. CD-Rom. Subscription price (until 31 December, 2006): €58; thereafter: €78

**Jérôme**, *Homélies sur Marc*. Texte latin de Dom Germain Morin (CCL 78). Introduction, traduction et notes par Jean-Louis **Gourdain** (SC 494). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2005. 232 p. 12,5 × 19,5. €27

*Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*. Volume 2 (2001-2005). Edited by Stanley E. **Porter**, Matthew Brook **O'Donnell** and Wendy J. **Porter**. Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005. 253 p. 16 × 24. £80.00 – \$140 – €120

**Katz**, Steven T. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Volume Four: The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006. xxvii-1135 p. 16 × 23,5. £120.00 – \$200.00

**Keil**, C. F. – **Delitzsch**, F., *Commentary on the Old Testament*. Premium Edition, CD-Rom. s. l., Hendrickson, 2006

**Kelle**, Brad E., *Hosea 2. Metaphor and Rhetoric in Historical Perspective* (Academia Biblica 20). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. xiv-355 p. 15 × 23. \$45.95

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.  
E-mail: [atla@atla.com](mailto:atla@atla.com). <http://www.atla.com/>

---

MICHELE SIMONE, Direttore Responsabile

---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

---

Finito di stampare il 22 marzo 2007

Tip.: Ist. Salesiano Pio XI - Via Umbertide, 11 - 00181 Roma